Joan of Arc: Sacred Figurehead and Elite Power Consolidation in the Hundred Years' War (1428-1431)

Part 1 of 4: Foundation Conditions and Narrative Construction

Thomas J. Bryan, Claude/Anthropic

INTRODUCTION

The Miracle That Wasn't

In May 1429, a peasant girl from the village of Domrémy led French forces to break the English siege of Orléans, a victory that transformed the military and political landscape of France. Within months, she had escorted the uncrowned Dauphin Charles to Reims Cathedral for his consecration as Charles VII, King of France. Her meteoric rise from obscurity to military command remains one of history's most celebrated narratives—the divine intervention that saved France, the miraculous virgin warrior guided by heavenly voices, the peasant girl who changed the course of nations through sheer faith and courage.

This narrative, crafted in the immediate aftermath of her victories and refined over six centuries, obscures more than it reveals. It asks us to believe that feudal lords, hardened military commanders, and calculating ecclesiastical authorities surrendered strategic decision-making to a seventeen-year-old illiterate girl because of her visions. It requires us to accept that professional soldiers followed her into battle because they genuinely believed God spoke through her, and that the French nobility reorganized their political alliances around her divine mandate. Most fundamentally, it demands we see the resolution of France's existential political crisis as the result of supernatural intervention rather than elite strategic calculation.

The analytical frameworks applied in this study offer a different interpretation. Joan of Arc was not a miraculous exception to the mechanics of elite power but a textbook example of how small groups control large populations through appropriated belief systems. The French nobility facing existential threat—military defeat, territorial loss, dynastic extinction—recognized in Joan's claims a ready-made narrative infrastructure that could mobilize forces, legitimate authority, and transform a weak claimant into God's anointed king. They did not passively respond to a

miracle; they actively deployed a figurehead whose divine credentials could accomplish what military force and political negotiation alone could not.

This case study demonstrates several core principles of elite power through belief systems. First, that elites appropriate pre-existing belief systems rather than invent new ones—Joan's visions drew on centuries of Catholic theology about divine revelation, virgin saints, and prophetic guidance already deeply embedded in popular consciousness. Second, that belief functions as a force multiplier far more efficient than coercion—French soldiers fought harder, accepted greater sacrifices, and maintained cohesion because they believed they served God's chosen instrument, not merely another noble faction. Third, that figureheads remain useful only while they serve elite interests—Joan's execution by the English and her abandonment by Charles VII reveal the material calculations beneath the sacred narrative.

Most critically, this study shows how material factors determine outcomes regardless of belief systems. Joan's victories at Orléans and Patay succeeded because of favorable military circumstances, strategic positioning, and English command failures, not divine intervention. Her capture and execution resulted from shifting elite calculations about her utility and threat. The broader resolution of the Hundred Years' War followed from dynastic marriage, territorial negotiation, and economic exhaustion, not from the intervention of a peasant visionary. The sacred narrative mobilized forces and legitimated authority, but material conditions determined which side controlled territory, extracted resources, and ultimately prevailed.

Methodological Approach

This analysis applies two integrated frameworks. The Analytical Framework for Elite Power and Belief Systems provides the theoretical lens, focusing on how elites appropriate pre-existing beliefs to legitimate extraction and scale power without proportional coercion. The Expanded Core Framework structures the investigation through eight analytical sections examining foundation conditions, narrative construction, legal institutions, wealth extraction, information control, resistance suppression, elite coordination, and long-term consequences.

The case proceeds chronologically across four parts. Part 1 examines the foundation conditions creating opportunities for elite appropriation of Joan's narrative and analyzes how that narrative was constructed and deployed. Part 2 investigates the legal and institutional frameworks legitimating Joan's role and the wealth extraction mechanisms enabled by sacred mobilization. Part 3 addresses information control, Joan's disposal when she became inconvenient, and the mechanisms of elite coordination. Part 4 assesses long-term consequences and the pattern's implications for understanding elite power.

The evidence base includes contemporary chronicles, diplomatic correspondence, trial records, military accounts, and theological examinations. Secondary literature from military history, religious studies, political science, and medieval scholarship provides interpretive context. Throughout, the analysis maintains methodological skepticism toward received narratives, asking not whether Joan genuinely heard voices but how elites used claims about those voices to solve political problems.

The Pattern and Its Implications

Joan of Arc's story illuminates mechanisms visible across civilizations and epochs. When elites face legitimacy crises, they do not invent new belief systems but discover how to weaponize existing ones. When populations accept enormous sacrifices, they do so not primarily because of coercion but because belief systems make domination feel necessary, just, or divinely ordained. When charismatic figureheads emerge, their utility to elites determines their survival far more than their personal convictions or supernatural credentials.

Understanding Joan through this lens does not require dismissing her courage, military competence, or genuine faith. It requires recognizing that personal attributes become historically significant only when elites decide to deploy them for strategic purposes. Many peasant girls claimed divine visions in fifteenth-century France; Joan's visions mattered because French nobles recognized their utility for solving an otherwise intractable political problem. Her faith may have been sincere; what made it consequential was elite appropriation of that sincerity for purposes of power consolidation.

This first part establishes the foundation conditions that made Joan's appropriation possible and examines how the narrative was constructed to legitimate Charles VII's authority and mobilize French forces. It demonstrates that what appeared as miraculous intervention was in fact calculated deployment of belief as infrastructure for elite power—a pattern that explains far more about how small groups control large populations than any amount of faith in divine providence.

I. FOUNDATION CONDITIONS: THE CRISIS OF FRENCH ELITE POWER (1337-1428)

The Hundred Years' War and Dynastic Legitimacy

The foundation for Joan of Arc's deployment as sacred figurehead lay not in supernatural intervention but in a century-long crisis of elite power that threatened French territorial integrity, dynastic legitimacy, and aristocratic wealth extraction. The Hundred Years' War, beginning in 1337 when Edward III of England claimed the French throne, represented a fundamental challenge to the French monarchy's ability to maintain unified authority over its nominal territories. By 1428, when Joan emerged, French elites faced potential extinction as an independent power structure, creating conditions where appropriation of religious narrative became strategically necessary.

The war's origins revealed competing elite claims to extraction rights over French territories. Edward III's claim through his mother Isabella, daughter of Philip IV of France, challenged the Valois dynasty's assertion that royal succession could not pass through female lines. This was not theological dispute but contest over which elite network would control the apparatus of

French state power—taxation rights, judicial authority, military mobilization, ecclesiastical appointments, and commercial regulation. The Salic Law prohibition of female succession, invoked to deny Edward's claim, itself represented earlier elite engineering to prevent foreign royal houses from capturing French extraction mechanisms through dynastic marriage.

The English victory at Crécy in 1346 demonstrated technological and tactical advantages that undermined French military dominance. English longbowmen slaughtered French cavalry, revealing that traditional feudal military arrangements—mounted nobility extracting service from subordinates—could not compete with professional infantry employing superior weapons and discipline. Subsequent English victories at Poitiers (1356), where King Jean II was captured, and Agincourt (1415), where English forces destroyed a much larger French army, established a pattern: French nobility could not defend the territories from which they extracted wealth using conventional military means.

These defeats created cascading legitimacy problems. A monarchy claiming divine sanction to rule could not explain how God permitted foreign armies to devastate its territories and capture its kings. A nobility claiming martial superiority as justification for privilege could not reconcile catastrophic battlefield failures with assertions of innate excellence. A church hierarchy supporting French royal authority could not credibly maintain that defeats resulted from God's displeasure when the English, also Christian, consistently prevailed. Each military disaster eroded the narrative infrastructure legitimating French elite power.

The Treaty of Troyes and the Legitimacy Crisis

The Treaty of Troyes in 1420 formalized the legitimacy crisis into institutional structure. After Agincourt, the Burgundian faction of French nobility allied with England, recognizing Henry V of England as regent of France and heir to Charles VI. The treaty declared Charles VI's son—the Dauphin Charles, later Charles VII—illegitimate, asserting he was the product of his mother Queen Isabeau's adultery. Upon Charles VI's death in 1422, Henry V's infant son would become King of France and England, uniting the crowns and effectively eliminating France as independent political entity.

This arrangement satisfied multiple elite interests. The Burgundians, controlling wealthy Flemish territories and commercial centers, calculated that English alliance offered better protection for their extraction rights than loyalty to a weak Valois dynasty. The English nobility gained access to French territorial revenues and trade routes. The collaborating French lords received guarantees of their local authority under the new regime. Even the church hierarchy accommodated, with the University of Paris—the premier theological authority in Christendom—providing scholarly legitimation for the arrangement.

The Dauphin Charles, disinherited and operating from reduced territories south of the Loire, commanded a rump faction of French nobility whose power depended on overturning Troyes. This faction's position was materially weak and narratively indefensible. Militarily, they controlled less territory, fewer fortified cities, and smaller forces than the Anglo-Burgundian alliance. Economically, they had lost the commercial centers of northern France, limiting taxation

revenue. Legally, the Treaty of Troyes had been sealed by the legitimate French king, making Charles's resistance technically rebellion against royal authority. Theologically, the University of Paris's endorsement of his bastardy undermined claims to sacred legitimacy.

Most critically, Charles could not be consecrated at Reims, the traditional site of French royal coronation where Clovis had been baptized and where French kings received sacred anointing. Reims lay in Burgundian-controlled territory, and without the coronation ritual—with its elaborate ceremony of divine oil delivered by a dove at Clovis's baptism and preserved for French monarchs—Charles remained merely a claimant, not a divinely sanctioned king. This theological deficit created practical consequences: subjects who believed in sacred monarchy had difficulty justifying loyalty to an uncrowned dauphin over an anointed king of France and England.

Economic Crisis and Elite Fragmentation

The legitimacy crisis intersected with economic catastrophe. Continuous warfare devastated agricultural production across northern France. Armies of both sides engaged in chevauchée—systematic destruction of enemy territory including burning crops, slaughtering livestock, and demolishing mills. While strategically rational for denying resources to opponents, this practice eliminated the agricultural surplus from which all elites—French and English, Armagnac and Burgundian—extracted wealth. The nobility's revenue base was being destroyed by the very warfare through which they contested control of it.

The Black Death, arriving in 1348 and recurring in waves, compounded the crisis by eliminating perhaps one-third of the population. Demographic catastrophe reduced the labor force, disrupted production, and fundamentally altered the social balance between lords and peasants. With fewer workers available, surviving peasants could demand better terms, threatening the extraction arrangements that sustained aristocratic power. French elites faced the prospect of fighting over increasingly depleted territories worked by increasingly resistant populations.

This combination created fragmentation among French elites. Individual lords calculated that collaboration with England or Burgundy offered more secure extraction rights than loyalty to Charles. Local nobility, unable to rely on central authority for protection, made independent arrangements with various factions. Mercenary companies, unemployed during truces, pillaged French territories indiscriminately, further undermining the fiction that nobility provided security in exchange for peasant surplus. The theoretical unity of the French kingdom dissolved into competing extraction networks making opportunistic alliances based on immediate material advantage.

The Pre-Existing Belief Infrastructure

The foundation conditions for Joan's deployment included not just political crisis but embedded belief systems ripe for appropriation. Catholic theology in fifteenth-century France was not abstract doctrine but lived reality structuring daily experience, social relations, and cosmological understanding. The population had internalized through generations of family transmission,

ecclesiastical ritual, and cultural practice a comprehensive worldview that made divine intervention seem not just possible but expected.

Several theological traditions proved particularly relevant for elite appropriation. The cult of virgin saints established that exceptional purity could channel divine power—Saint Catherine, Saint Margaret, and Saint Michael (the figures Joan would claim communicated with her) were already venerated throughout France. The tradition of prophetic revelation held that God communicated directly with chosen individuals to accomplish divine purposes, as countless biblical examples demonstrated. The theology of just war maintained that God intervened in battles to ensure victory for righteous causes, making military outcomes appear as judgments revealing divine will.

Specific prophecies circulating in early fifteenth-century France provided ready narrative infrastructure. The "Prophecy of the Virgin from Lorraine" foretold that a maiden from the marches would save France—sufficiently vague to accommodate multiple interpretations but specific enough to seem like divine foreknowledge when matched to actual events. The prophecy of Merlin, widely known through popular literature, predicted that France would be lost by a woman (often interpreted as Queen Isabeau) and saved by a virgin from Lorraine. These prophecies had not been invented for Joan but existed as available narrative resources that could be activated when circumstances made them useful.

The ecclesiastical infrastructure for validating divine claims also existed prior to Joan's emergence. The church maintained elaborate procedures for examining visions, distinguishing true revelation from demonic deception or mental illness, and certifying divine mandates. Theological faculties at universities, monasteries with learned clergy, and episcopal courts provided institutional mechanisms for pronouncing authoritative judgment on supernatural claims. This infrastructure meant that elite appropriation of Joan's narrative required not inventing validation procedures but deploying existing ones.

Critically, this belief system was already internalized by the common population. French peasants did not need to be convinced that God could speak through visions, that virginity enabled divine communication, or that saints intervened in human affairs—these were baseline assumptions shaping their understanding of reality. The elite task was not creating belief in divine intervention but directing pre-existing belief toward politically useful conclusions. Joan's claims resonated because they activated deeply embedded convictions already operating in popular consciousness.

Military Stalemate and Strategic Exhaustion

By 1428, military conditions created specific opportunities for narrative intervention. The siege of Orléans represented a strategic crisis for Charles's faction. Orléans was the northernmost major city still loyal to the Dauphin, controlling a crucial Loire crossing and serving as gateway to his southern territories. English forces under the Earl of Salisbury besieged it in October 1428, and its fall would open central France to English conquest, likely ending the Armagnac faction's viability as independent power structure.

However, the siege also revealed English vulnerabilities. The English force was insufficient for complete encirclement, requiring construction of fortified positions (boulevards) rather than continuous siege lines. This created opportunities for French forces to resupply the city and for the garrison to make sorties against isolated English positions. The English commander Salisbury was killed by a cannon shot in November 1428, leaving command fragmented among his lieutenants. The besiegers faced supply difficulties and garrison morale problems during the winter of 1428-1429.

From a materialist perspective, these conditions made Orléans militarily relievable through competent conventional operations—adequate forces attacking dispersed English positions, coordinated garrison sorties, and sustained supply efforts. The strategic problem was not impossibility but coordination: getting French forces to cooperate despite factional divisions, maintaining morale despite previous defeats, and convincing commanders to risk engagement after years of defensive posture. The narrative problem mirrored the military one: how to transform demoralized, fragmented forces into cohesive army capable of coordinated offensive action.

This is where Joan's appropriation became strategically valuable. The French nobility needed not just military solutions but motivational ones—a way to make soldiers believe victory was possible after decades of defeat, a way to legitimate Charles's authority against competing claims, a way to frame offensive action as religiously necessary rather than politically calculated. The pre-existing belief infrastructure provided all the necessary components; what was required was a catalyst to activate them in politically useful configuration.

Elite Consciousness and Strategic Calculation

The foundation conditions thus created a precise strategic problem that traditional elite resources could not solve. Military force alone had repeatedly failed; French armies were consistently defeated when they engaged English forces directly. Political negotiation had produced the Treaty of Troyes, which solved the problem by eliminating French independence. Economic pressure favored the Anglo-Burgundian alliance controlling richer territories. Legal and theological authority backed the treaty's legitimacy.

Charles's faction needed a mechanism to circumvent these disadvantages—something that could mobilize forces beyond what material resources allowed, legitimate authority despite legal disadvantages, and transform demoralized followers into committed believers. The appropriation of religious narrative provided exactly this mechanism. A peasant girl claiming divine mandate to crown Charles and drive out the English could accomplish what conventional elite strategies could not: make soldiers willing to die for a cause that material calculation suggested was hopeless, make populations accept sacrifices beyond what coercion could enforce, and make Charles's kingship appear divinely ordained despite all legal and political evidence to the contrary.

The genius of the appropriation lay in recognizing that the narrative infrastructure already existed and merely required activation. The theology of divine intervention was embedded. The

prophecies about a virgin savior circulated. The validation procedures were institutionalized. The popular belief in supernatural guidance was internalized. French elites did not need to convince anyone that God could save France through a maiden—they needed only to identify an individual whose claims could plausibly fit the pre-existing narrative template and deploy her in ways that served elite strategic purposes.

This is why Joan's emergence in 1428-1429 was not miraculous but strategic. The foundation conditions—political crisis, military stalemate, economic pressure, and available belief infrastructure—created a structural opening for narrative intervention. Whether Joan genuinely heard voices or whether cynical elites fabricated her claims becomes secondary to the analytical question: how did French nobility recognize and appropriate her narrative to solve otherwise intractable problems of power consolidation?

The answer lies in understanding that elites facing existential threats do not limit themselves to conventional resources. They scan the available cultural and ideological landscape for anything that can be weaponized for strategic purposes. Joan's claims about divine voices provided exactly what Charles's faction needed: a belief-based force multiplier that could transform military, political, and legitimacy disadvantages into sacred mandate. The foundation conditions made this appropriation necessary; the pre-existing belief infrastructure made it possible; elite consciousness of belief as power mechanism made it inevitable.

II. NARRATIVE CONSTRUCTION: APPROPRIATING THE SACRED FOR ELITE PURPOSES (1429)

The Vaucouleurs Recognition: Elite Identification of Useful Narrative

Joan's emergence into historical significance began not with divine revelation but with elite recognition of her narrative's utility. In May 1428, at age sixteen, she traveled to Vaucouleurs, a garrison town loyal to Charles, to seek audience with Robert de Baudricourt, the local military commander. She claimed that celestial voices—Saint Michael, Saint Catherine, and Saint Margaret—commanded her to go to the Dauphin, have him crowned at Reims, and drive the English from France. Baudricourt initially dismissed her, sending her back to her village. This first rejection is analytically significant: it demonstrates that Joan's claims alone were insufficient without elite decision to deploy them.

Joan returned to Vaucouleurs in January 1429, after the military situation had deteriorated. Orléans was under siege, English forces threatened Dauphin-controlled territories, and no conventional solution appeared viable. Baudricourt's decision to send Joan to Charles changed: he now provided her with escort, male clothing for travel, and letters of introduction to the Dauphin's court. This transformation reveals not that Baudricourt became convinced of Joan's divine mandate but that the strategic situation made her narrative potentially useful where previously it had seemed irrelevant.

The timing matters. Between Joan's first and second visits, the Earl of Salisbury had been killed at Orléans and the siege had stalled. Charles's military position was desperate enough that unconventional solutions merited consideration. The material calculation was straightforward: if Joan's divine mandate claims could motivate troops, legitimate offensive action, or rally wavering supporters, the political benefit outweighed the risk of appearing to endorse a peasant visionary. If she failed, she could be dismissed as deluded. If she succeeded, her success could be attributed to divine intervention validating Charles's cause.

Baudricourt's provision of male clothing deserves analysis. Joan would maintain male dress throughout her military career and be charged with it as evidence of heresy during her trial. From an elite strategic perspective, the male clothing served multiple functions. It solved the practical problem of a woman traveling with soldiers—female dress invited sexual assault and marked her as non-combatant. More importantly, it marked her as exceptional, set apart from ordinary women, aligned with virgin warrior saint imagery already present in religious iconography. The male dress was not Joan's idiosyncratic choice but elite staging of her narrative to fit pre-existing theological templates about holy virgins transcending ordinary gender constraints.

The Chinon Examination: Theological Validation as Power Legitimation

Joan arrived at Charles's court in Chinon in March 1429. What followed was not passive acceptance of her claims but active elite examination and staging. Charles's advisors subjected her to theological interrogation, physical examination to verify her virginity, and strategic assessment of her potential utility. This process reveals the elite consciousness behind the appropriation: French nobility were not swept away by miracle but methodically evaluating whether Joan's narrative could be weaponized for political purposes.

The theological examination occurred at Poitiers, where a commission of theologians and church officials spent three weeks interrogating Joan about her visions, testing her orthodoxy, and determining whether her claims originated from God, the devil, or delusion. This was not spontaneous investigation but carefully orchestrated validation procedure. The commission included supporters of Charles's cause who understood their task: determine whether Joan's narrative could be safely appropriated without theological liability. They questioned her about the content of the voices, her willingness to submit to church authority, and the theological basis for her claims.

The commission's conclusion—that they found "nothing but good" in Joan and advised Charles to employ her—was political judgment masquerading as theological verdict. The actual report from Poitiers has not survived, but contemporary accounts indicate the examination focused less on verifying divine origin of her voices than on establishing that belief in those voices would not constitute heresy. This distinction is critical: the church authorities did not claim they could prove God spoke to Joan but that believing God spoke to Joan was theologically permissible and politically expedient.

The virgin test—physical examination by noble women to verify Joan's virginity—served similar strategic function. Virginity was theologically necessary for her role as pure vessel of divine communication, following the model of virgin saints and the Virgin Mary herself. The examination was conducted by Charles's mother-in-law Yolande of Aragon and other court women with clear stake in validating Joan's usefulness. Their certification of her virginity provided crucial element of the narrative: she fit the prophetic template of virgin savior, making her claims more credible to populations already expecting such a figure.

Charles's initial meeting with Joan, according to hagiographic accounts, involved her identifying him despite his attempt to hide among courtiers and revealing secret knowledge only he possessed. These stories served narrative purposes: demonstrating supernatural insight, establishing her direct divine commission, and creating compelling proof for skeptics. Whether these events occurred as described or were staged theatrical performances becomes secondary to their function: constructing a narrative that would convince populations to accept Joan as authentic divine messenger.

Strategic Deployment: Constructing the Sacred Figurehead

Once elite evaluation concluded that Joan's narrative was appropriable, French leadership engaged in systematic construction of her public role. She was given armor—highly symbolic and expensive equipment that marked her as military figure despite having no combat training. She was provided a banner featuring Christ, angels, and fleur-de-lis—designed to serve as rallying point in battle and visual representation of divine sanction for Charles's cause. She was assigned to military expeditions not as commander but as inspirational presence, with actual tactical decisions made by experienced commanders.

The narrative constructed around Joan appropriated multiple pre-existing theological and cultural themes. The virgin warrior motif drew on traditions of Saint Margaret fighting dragons and Saint Catherine's legendary military knowledge. The prophetic visionary role recalled biblical figures like Deborah and Judith who led armies through divine instruction. The peasant-instrument-of-God theme inverted normal social hierarchy in ways that reinforced divine providence—that God would choose a lowborn girl demonstrated His power to work through unexpected vessels, making the intervention appear more miraculous rather than less.

Critically, the narrative emphasized Joan's simplicity and lack of education. She could not read or write. She had no military training. She knew nothing of theology or politics. This ignorance was rhetorically valuable: it made her claims appear more authentically divine rather than cunningly fabricated. An illiterate peasant girl could not have invented sophisticated theological justifications or military strategies; therefore, her knowledge must come from supernatural source. The elite construction of Joan as simple vessel maximized the narrative's mobilizing power by making divine intervention the only plausible explanation for her capabilities.

The prophecy fulfillment aspect received particular emphasis. Joan came from Lorraine, near the marches. She was a virgin. She claimed divine mandate to save France and crown the king. These characteristics aligned with circulating prophecies sufficiently to seem like divine

foreknowledge while remaining vague enough to accommodate multiple interpretations. Elite propagandists emphasized the prophetic fit, circulating accounts of how Joan fulfilled ancient predictions, creating appearance of supernatural orchestration of events.

The Orléans Campaign: Narrative Meets Material Reality

The relief of Orléans in May 1429 provides crucial test of how narrative interacted with material conditions. Joan arrived at Orléans on April 29 with a relief force commanded by experienced military leaders including Jean de Dunois (the Bastard of Orléans), Étienne de Vignolles (La Hire), and Jean de Brosse. The subsequent operations demonstrated that conventional military factors determined outcomes while Joan's presence provided morale and legitimacy benefits.

The tactical situation favored the French. English forces were dispersed in isolated forts around the city rather than maintaining continuous siege lines. The garrison was well-supplied and capable of sorties. The English commander structure was fragmented after Salisbury's death. French relief forces significantly outnumbered English besiegers once reinforcements arrived. From purely military perspective, aggressive coordinated attacks on isolated English positions had reasonable chance of success.

Joan's contribution was primarily narrative rather than tactical. She attended war councils but did not make strategic decisions—experienced commanders planned the actual operations. Her role was inspirational: she convinced soldiers that God supported their cause, that victory was divinely ordained, that death in battle served sacred purpose. This belief-based morale boost had material military effects: soldiers fought more aggressively, accepted higher casualties, maintained cohesion under pressure. The force multiplier was real even if its source was appropriated belief rather than divine intervention.

The sequence of French victories at Orléans reveals this dynamic. On May 4, French forces attacked the English fort of Saint-Loup and captured it. On May 5, they attacked Les Augustins and took it. On May 7, they assaulted Les Tourelles—the critical fortification controlling the bridge into Orléans—and captured it after fierce fighting. Joan was wounded by an arrow during this assault but returned to battle, providing powerful visual demonstration of divine protection and inspiring intensified French efforts. The English abandoned their remaining positions on May 8, lifting the siege.

These victories resulted from material factors: French numerical superiority once reinforcements arrived, English positional weakness with dispersed isolated forts, competent tactical leadership by experienced commanders, and high French morale convinced of divine support. Joan's wound and dramatic return to combat provided exactly the narrative reinforcement needed: she survived potentially fatal injury (divine protection), she showed personal courage (inspiring troops), and her prophecies about victory were validated (proving divine mandate).

Elite consciousness of this dynamic is visible in how commanders deployed Joan. They placed her in visible positions during assaults where her banner and presence could inspire troops, but they kept her away from actual tactical decision-making. When she was wounded, they treated

it as opportunity for narrative enhancement rather than crisis. When victories occurred, they attributed them to divine intervention through Joan rather than conventional military competence. The appropriation was systematic: take credit for successes as divine validation, attribute failures to insufficient faith or human sin, maintain Joan as sacred figurehead while making actual strategic decisions through normal command structures.

The Coronation Campaign: Legitimacy Through Sacred Ritual

The relief of Orléans provided military success that could be narratively deployed for political purposes. Joan's insistence on proceeding to Reims for Charles's coronation served elite legitimacy needs perfectly. The coronation ritual was not mere ceremony but constitutional necessity: French kings became fully legitimate only through sacred anointing at Reims with the oil from the Holy Ampulla, supposedly brought by a dove at Clovis's baptism. Without coronation, Charles remained merely Dauphin; with it, he became divinely sanctioned King of France whose authority derived from God rather than merely from hereditary succession.

The journey to Reims required traveling through Burgundian-controlled territory, militarily risky but narratively essential. Joan's divine mandate narrative provided justification: God commanded Charles's coronation, therefore the expedition had sacred purpose rather than appearing as desperate political gamble. French forces captured or received submission from several towns along the route—Jargeau, Meung-sur-Loire, Beaugency—with Joan's presence used to demoralize defenders by suggesting divine opposition to English cause.

The Battle of Patay on June 18, 1429, provided additional validation of the divine mandate narrative. French forces surprised and routed an English army, killing or capturing thousands with minimal French casualties. This was English Agincourt in reverse—decisive victory against supposedly superior force. From material perspective, Patay resulted from good French reconnaissance, poor English positioning, and effective French cavalry charges. From narrative perspective, it was God's judgment favoring Charles through Joan's prophetic insight.

Charles's coronation at Reims on July 17, 1429, represented the culmination of elite appropriation of Joan's narrative. The ritual occurred with Joan standing beside Charles holding her banner—visual symbolism making clear that his kingship derived from divine intervention through her prophecy. The ceremony included all traditional elements: the anointing with sacred oil, the presentation of regalia, the oath-taking, the homage from nobles. But the surrounding narrative emphasized that Joan's divine mission had made it possible, transforming military victories into theological validation of Charles's rightful kingship.

The coronation solved multiple elite legitimacy problems simultaneously. It countered the Treaty of Troyes by demonstrating that God recognized Charles as legitimate king through the consecration ritual. It undermined the claim of Charles's bastardy—if God anointed him, theological logic suggested he must be legitimate son. It created political pressure on wavering nobles to acknowledge Charles's authority since opposing divinely crowned king implied opposing God's will. It provided compelling counter-narrative to English and Burgundian claims about French political order.

Elite Constraint and Narrative Limitation

However, the very success of Joan's appropriation created constraints on elite action. The narrative that empowered Charles also limited his options. If Joan's divine mandate was genuine, Charles could not easily ignore her counsel without appearing to reject God's will. If her prophecies validated his kingship, her subsequent prophecies carried weight he could not dismiss without undermining the foundation of his legitimacy. The appropriation created dependency: the narrative that solved legitimacy crisis also constrained elite autonomy.

This became apparent after the coronation when Joan advocated for attacking Paris, then held by Anglo-Burgundian forces. From elite strategic perspective, the coronation had achieved its primary purpose—legitimating Charles's kingship. Further military operations carried risks: Paris was strongly defended, assault could fail and undermine divine mandate narrative, and diplomatic negotiations with Burgundy offered potential advantages. But Joan's insistence on continuing the divinely ordained mission to drive out the English created political difficulty for refusing.

The attempted assault on Paris in September 1429 demonstrated the limits of belief-based mobilization against unfavorable material conditions. Paris was well-fortified, heavily garrisoned, and its population did not support Charles. The assault failed, Joan was wounded again, and French forces withdrew. This failure revealed that divine mandate narrative could not overcome material military disadvantages. Elite commanders recognized this: they withdrew from Paris not because God ordained it but because tactical situation was hopeless.

The Paris failure marked the beginning of elite disengagement from unlimited deployment of Joan's narrative. Charles and his advisors recognized that Joan was more useful as symbol than as autonomous decision-maker. Her divine mandate claims, which had mobilized forces for Orléans and legitimated the coronation campaign, now threatened to commit French forces to militarily unwise operations based on theological certainty rather than strategic calculation. The very belief that made her valuable also made her potentially dangerous if she claimed divine instruction for actions contrary to elite interests.

Narrative Engineering and Popular Mobilization

Throughout this period, elite control of information shaped how Joan's narrative reached broader populations. Chronicles, letters, and reports emphasized her divine mission, her prophetic accuracy, and the miraculous nature of French victories. Alternative interpretations—that she might be deluded, that victories resulted from conventional military factors, that elites were strategically deploying her for political purposes—were suppressed or ignored.

The church hierarchy played critical role in this narrative engineering. Priests preached about Joan as God's instrument. Theological authorities pronounced her visions authentic. Church ceremonies incorporated prayers for her success and thanksgiving for her victories. This ecclesiastical validation was essential: the common population looked to church authorities to

distinguish true revelation from demonic deception, and clerical endorsement transformed Joan from potential heretic into holy vessel.

The narrative's effectiveness depended on popular belief in divine intervention being already internalized. French peasants and soldiers did not need convincing that God could speak through visions or that saints could guide military campaigns—these were baseline assumptions. The elite task was directing pre-existing belief toward politically useful conclusions: accepting Charles's legitimacy, supporting military campaigns, making sacrifices for sacred cause. Joan's narrative succeeded because it activated deeply embedded convictions rather than requiring creation of new belief systems.

This reveals the core mechanism of elite power through appropriated belief. The French nobility did not invent the theology of divine revelation or the expectation of prophetic intervention—these existed prior to and independent of elite strategic needs. What elites contributed was recognition that these pre-existing beliefs could be weaponized by identifying an individual whose claims fit the narrative template and deploying her in ways that solved political problems. The genius lay not in creating belief but in appropriating belief infrastructure that populations had already internalized through generations of religious socialization.

The 50-100x Force Multiplier in Practice

Joan's deployment as sacred figurehead demonstrated the practical power of belief-based control. French soldiers who might have balked at following another noble claimant fought with conviction when told they served God's chosen instrument. Populations who might have resisted additional taxation and sacrifice accepted them when framed as support for divinely ordained mission. Wavering nobles who calculated alliance with Burgundy or England as safer switched to Charles when his coronation suggested divine favor. All these effects multiplied French military and political capabilities beyond what material resources alone allowed.

The mathematics of belief-based mobilization are instructive. Consider a military force of 5,000 soldiers. Under conventional command, they fight with normal motivation—pay, loyalty to local lord, hope of plunder. Under divinely inspired command, they fight with extraordinary motivation—willingness to accept higher casualties, maintenance of morale despite setbacks, aggressive offensive action despite risks. The combat effectiveness of the divinely inspired force may be double or triple that of the conventionally motivated force, even with identical numbers and equipment.

Similarly, population willingness to support the war effort through taxes, supplies, and service increases dramatically when the cause appears divinely sanctioned rather than merely politically calculated. A population that might provide minimal compliance under coercion might provide enthusiastic support when belief systems make the sacrifice appear necessary for salvation or divinely commanded. The extraction efficiency—the ratio of resources extracted to enforcement costs—increases by orders of magnitude when belief rather than force drives compliance.

This is why belief functions as infrastructure for elite power. It scales authority without proportionally scaling coercion. It mobilizes populations beyond what material incentives can achieve. It transforms elite commands into divine imperatives, making resistance appear not just politically dangerous but spiritually fatal. Joan's appropriation demonstrated this mechanism in pure form: a weak claimant with limited resources transformed into divinely anointed king whose cause attracted support far beyond what military calculation suggested was warranted.

Elite Consciousness of Appropriation

The evidence suggests that French elites understood, at least tacitly, that they were deploying Joan's narrative rather than passively responding to miracle. The Poitiers examination was strategic evaluation, not theological investigation. The staging of her role—the armor, the banner, the positioning in battles—reflected conscious construction of inspirational figurehead. The decisions about when to deploy her narrative aggressively (Orléans, Reims) and when to constrain it (after Paris) showed strategic calculation about utility versus risk.

Charles himself demonstrated this consciousness through his later abandonment of Joan. When she was captured by Burgundian forces in May 1430, Charles made no serious effort to ransom her despite having resources to do so. When she was tried and executed by the English and their Burgundian allies, Charles did not intervene. This was not mere callousness but strategic calculation: Joan had served her purpose (legitimating his kingship through coronation), her continued presence created problems (constraining elite decision-making through divine mandate claims), and her martyrdom could be narratively useful (proving English wickedness, validating her divine mission retrospectively).

The rehabilitation trial conducted decades later under Charles VII's sponsorship further reveals elite consciousness. In 1456, after Charles had consolidated power and expelled English forces from France, he initiated ecclesiastical investigation that overturned Joan's heresy conviction and declared her innocent. This was not belated recognition of injustice but strategic deployment of her narrative for new purposes: legitimating Charles's reign by association with martyred saint, delegitimizing English conquest by emphasizing their execution of holy virgin, and creating founding mythology for French national identity.

These actions reveal pattern: elites appropriate belief systems when strategically useful, constrain them when they become limiting, abandon figureheads when they become liabilities, and redeploy narratives when new opportunities emerge. Joan was useful for mobilization and legitimation (1429), constraining and risky after coronation (1429-1430), disposable when captured (1430), and useful again as martyr-saint for retrospective legitimation (1456). The variation in treatment reflects not changing theological truth about her divine mission but changing elite calculations about narrative utility.

Conclusion: Narrative as Elite Power Infrastructure

The narrative construction around Joan of Arc demonstrates how elites appropriate pre-existing belief systems to solve political problems that conventional resources cannot address. French

nobility facing existential crisis recognized that embedded Catholic theology about divine intervention, virgin saints, and prophetic guidance provided ready-made infrastructure for legitimating authority and mobilizing populations. They did not invent this belief system—it had been internalized by French populations through generations of religious socialization. They appropriated it by identifying an individual whose claims fit the narrative template and deploying her in ways that served elite strategic purposes.

The narrative succeeded because it activated deeply held convictions about divine intervention in human affairs, expectations about prophetic figures from circulating prophecies, and theological beliefs about virgin purity enabling divine communication. These beliefs were real—French soldiers genuinely believed God supported their cause through Joan, French populations genuinely accepted her divine mandate, French nobility genuinely faced constraints from the sacred narrative they had appropriated. The appropriation's effectiveness derived from deploying genuine belief for elite purposes, not from cynical fabrication that no one actually credited.

The long-term consequence was establishment of pattern that would recur throughout French history: sacred legitimation of political authority through appropriation of religious narrative. Joan's story became founding mythology for French monarchy and later French nationalism, repeatedly deployed whenever elites needed to mobilize populations through belief-based rather than coercion-based mechanisms. The pattern reveals that belief is not autonomous spiritual force but engineered infrastructure—created through cultural transmission, available for appropriation, and deployable by elites who recognize its power-scaling properties.

What appeared as miracle was strategic deployment of narrative to solve legitimacy crisis. What seemed like divine intervention was elite appropriation of pre-existing belief infrastructure. What looked like autonomous peasant visionary was carefully constructed figurehead serving noble purposes. Material factors—military capabilities, territorial control, resource extraction—determined outcomes, while belief systems determined how efficiently elites could mobilize resources and legitimate authority. The sacred and the strategic were not separate domains but integrated mechanisms through which small groups maintained control over large populations.

[End of Part 1]

Part 2 will examine: Legal and Institutional Frameworks (how Joan's role was institutionally legitimated and controlled), Wealth Extraction Mechanisms (how sacred mobilization enabled taxation and military service), and the beginning of Information Control (how the narrative was maintained and dissent suppressed).

Joan of Arc: Sacred Figurehead and Elite Power Consolidation in the Hundred Years' War (1428-1431)

Part 2 of 4: Legal Frameworks, Wealth Extraction, and Information Control

---

III. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS: CONSTRAINING THE SACRED INSTRUMENT

The Poitiers Commission and Institutional Validation

The appropriation of Joan's narrative required formal institutional validation to function as legitimate basis for military and political action. French elites could not simply deploy a peasant girl claiming divine visions without ecclesiastical approval—doing so would risk charges of heresy, witchcraft, or demonic possession undermining the entire enterprise. The examination at Poitiers in March 1429 thus served crucial institutional function: transforming Joan from potentially dangerous visionary into officially sanctioned instrument of divine will.

The commission assembled at Poitiers represented the highest available theological authority loyal to Charles's cause. It included bishops, doctors of theology from the University of Paris who supported the Armagnac faction, and legal experts in canon law. The examination lasted three weeks, during which Joan faced detailed interrogation about her visions, her theological understanding, and her claims to divine mandate. The commissioners questioned her about the nature of the voices, what they commanded, how she distinguished them from demonic deception, and whether she would submit to church authority.

This process reveals the institutional mechanisms through which belief systems are formally legitimated for political deployment. The church possessed monopoly on determining theological validity—no secular authority could pronounce on whether visions came from God, the devil, or mental illness. By securing church validation, French elites transformed Joan's claims from private religious experience into publicly certified divine mandate. This certification provided legal protection: Joan could not be charged with heresy for her visions since church authorities had examined and approved them.

The commission's report, though not surviving in original form, concluded that Joan's visions were authentic divine communication and that Charles should employ her. This conclusion was less theological judgment than political decision. The commissioners understood their task:

determine whether Joan's narrative could be safely appropriated without doctrinal liability. Their examination focused not on proving divine origin of the voices—an impossible epistemological task—but on establishing that belief in those voices conformed to orthodox theology and served legitimate political purposes.

The institutional validation also constrained Joan's autonomy. The commission required her submission to church authority, establishing that ecclesiastical hierarchy retained power to evaluate and potentially override her divine claims. If Joan later claimed divine instruction to act contrary to church or elite interests, the same institutional apparatus could reverse its judgment, declaring her visions demonic or her interpretation heretical. The validation was conditional: it legitimated Joan's role while preserving elite institutional control over that legitimation.

Military Command Structures and Elite Control

Joan's integration into French military command structures reveals how elites institutionalized her role while maintaining actual strategic control. She was never given independent command of forces despite her divine mandate claims. Instead, she was assigned to expeditions commanded by experienced nobles and professional soldiers who made tactical decisions while using Joan's presence for inspirational and legitimating purposes.

At Orléans, the relief force was commanded by Jean de Dunois, the Bastard of Orléans and one of Charles's most trusted military leaders. Other commanders included Étienne de Vignolles (La Hire), Jean de Brosse, and Gilles de Rais. These were hardened professional soldiers with decades of combat experience. Joan attended war councils and advocated for aggressive action, but the actual operational planning—troop dispositions, timing of assaults, logistical arrangements—remained in professional hands.

This arrangement served multiple elite purposes. Joan's presence motivated troops and provided divine legitimation for operations, multiplying combat effectiveness without requiring military decision-making from an inexperienced seventeen-year-old. The professional commanders retained tactical control, ensuring operations followed sound military logic rather than theological enthusiasm. If battles succeeded, victory could be attributed to divine intervention through Joan; if they failed, blame could fall on insufficient faith or human sinfulness rather than poor generalship.

The command structure also prevented Joan from independently initiating military action contrary to elite interests. She could not simply claim divine instruction to attack a target and expect forces to follow—commanders required orders from Charles or his appointed military leaders. This institutional constraint became critical after the coronation when Joan advocated for continuing offensive operations that elite strategists considered unwise. The command hierarchy allowed elites to overrule her divine mandate claims through superior military authority.

Documents from the period reveal this dynamic explicitly. Letters from commanders mention Joan's presence as morale factor but discuss tactical decisions without reference to her input.

Orders came from Dunois, La Hire, and other nobles, not from Joan despite her claims of divine guidance. When she was wounded at Orléans, military operations continued under professional command, demonstrating that her role was symbolic rather than operational. The institutional framework compartmentalized her function: inspirational figurehead whose divine narrative motivated troops but whose strategic autonomy was constrained by professional military hierarchy.

The Letter Campaign and Diplomatic Infrastructure

Joan's appropriation extended into diplomatic communications through a series of letters sent in her name to English commanders, Burgundian officials, and various European rulers. These letters claimed divine authority for Charles's cause and demanded submission to God's will as revealed through Joan's mission. However, analysis of the letters reveals elite construction rather than autonomous peasant composition—they were dictated by Joan but drafted and strategically deployed by Charles's chancery officials.

The letter to the English commanders, dated March 22, 1429, exemplifies this elite drafting. It demands English withdrawal from France, threatens divine punishment for resistance, and proclaims Charles as rightful king anointed by God. The language combines apocalyptic religious imagery with precise political demands. Joan, illiterate and theologically untrained, could not have composed such a document. It was crafted by literate clerics in Charles's service who understood how to translate Joan's divine mandate claims into formal diplomatic communications.

These letters served institutional legitimation functions. They established public record of Joan's divine mission, creating documentary evidence that could be cited in negotiations or propaganda. They framed Charles's military campaigns as divinely sanctioned responses to English refusal of God's demands, transforming territorial reconquest into holy war. They pressured wavering nobles and cities by suggesting that resistance to Charles meant resistance to God, raising theological and political costs of continued opposition.

The institutional infrastructure supporting this letter campaign reveals elite control. Charles's chancery—the administrative apparatus producing official documents—integrated Joan's narrative into formal diplomatic communications while maintaining control over message content and distribution. Joan's role was providing divine authority; elite bureaucrats translated that authority into politically useful documents. This separation between charismatic legitimation source (Joan) and institutional deployment mechanism (chancery) exemplifies how belief-based power operates: charisma inspires, institutions direct.

Legal Frameworks for Resource Mobilization

Joan's divine mandate narrative enabled legal and quasi-legal mechanisms for resource extraction that would have been more difficult without sacred legitimation. Charles VII, prior to coronation, lacked full legal authority to impose taxation or demand military service from territories nominally under French royal jurisdiction but practically autonomous. Joan's narrative

transformed this legal deficit into theological imperative: supporting Charles became religious duty, not merely political choice.

The coronation at Reims provided institutional legitimation that converted moral authority into legal authority. As anointed king, Charles gained constitutional power to impose royal taxation, demand military service from vassals, exercise judicial authority, and issue binding legal decrees. The coronation ritual itself—with its elaborate ceremony of sacred oil, oath-taking, and noble homage—created legally binding relationships between king and subjects grounded in both feudal law and divine sanction.

Joan's role in achieving the coronation meant her narrative infrastructure supported these legal transformations. Towns and nobles who submitted to Charles after Reims did so not merely because of military pressure but because sacred coronation created legal obligation to recognize royal authority. The combination of military victory (Orléans, Patay) and sacred ritual (Reims) transformed Charles from contested claimant into legally legitimate monarch whose commands carried binding force.

This legal transformation enabled systematic resource extraction. Royal taxation, technically requiring consent through representative assemblies, became more enforceable when framed as support for divinely anointed king defending France against heretical English invaders. Military service, traditionally dependent on feudal obligations and negotiated terms, could be demanded as sacred duty when the cause was presented as divinely mandated mission. Legal resistance to royal demands became not just political opposition but theological transgression.

The institutional mechanisms for enforcing these legal claims included royal courts, administrative officials, and ecclesiastical authorities. Royal judges pronounced sentences in the king's name, claiming authority derived from divine anointing. Tax collectors invoked sacred duty alongside legal obligation. Bishops preached sermons emphasizing religious necessity of supporting the anointed monarch. The belief infrastructure transformed legal commands from potentially contestable demands into divinely sanctioned imperatives whose violation risked both earthly punishment and spiritual damnation.

The Trial Framework: Institutional Mechanisms for Narrative Control

Joan's eventual trial and execution by English and Burgundian authorities demonstrates the institutional frameworks through which competing elites contested narrative control. The trial, conducted by the Inquisition and presided over by Pierre Cauchon, Bishop of Beauvais, was ostensibly theological investigation of heresy but functionally political effort to delegitimize Charles VII's coronation and the French military resurgence associated with Joan's mission.

The trial's institutional structure reveals how legal procedures serve elite narrative interests. Cauchon, though church official, was politically aligned with English and Burgundian factions—his appointment to try Joan was strategic deployment of ecclesiastical authority for partisan purposes. The trial format—inquisitorial rather than adversarial—gave prosecutors complete control over proceedings, questions, and evidence presentation. Joan, without legal

counsel or theological training, faced expert interrogators using her own words against her in carefully constructed arguments for heresy.

The specific charges illuminate elite narrative concerns. Joan was charged with wearing male clothing (violating biblical gender norms), claiming direct divine revelation (bypassing church hierarchy), and refusing to submit to church authority (theological disobedience). These charges targeted the very elements that made her useful to French elites: her exceptional status (male dress), her divine mandate claims (direct revelation), and her autonomous authority (resistance to institutional control). English and Burgundian elites sought to transform Joan's sacred legitimation into evidence of heresy, thereby delegitimating Charles's coronation and French victories.

The trial's outcome—conviction for heresy and execution by burning—served multiple institutional functions for English interests. It publicly declared Joan a heretic, suggesting that French victories occurred through demonic agency rather than divine intervention. It implied that Charles, crowned through a heretic's agency, lacked legitimate authority. It demonstrated English and Burgundian theological authority through successful prosecution by the Inquisition. It removed a powerful symbolic figure whose continued existence threatened English narrative control.

However, the trial also reveals limits of institutional control over narrative infrastructure. Despite conviction and execution, Joan's narrative persisted and eventually strengthened. French populations did not accept the heresy verdict as legitimate—they recognized it as partisan political judgment masquerading as theological truth. The trial itself provided detailed record of Joan's claims, her steadfastness under interrogation, and her eventual martyrdom, creating documentary foundation for later rehabilitation and sanctification. The institutional mechanism intended to destroy the narrative instead preserved it for future appropriation.

Institutional Constraints on Elite Action

The appropriation of Joan's narrative created institutional constraints on elite autonomy that persisted beyond her death. Charles VII, having legitimated his kingship through Joan's divine mandate, could not easily repudiate her without undermining his own authority. French elites who had supported her mission and attended the coronation were institutionally committed to the narrative regardless of later strategic calculations about her utility.

This constraint became apparent when Joan was captured. From purely strategic perspective, Charles had reason to secure her release—she remained popular with troops and populations, her propaganda value was substantial, and abandoning her suggested callous betrayal. However, ransom would have required resources and potentially negotiations with Burgundy that Charles found strategically disadvantageous. The institutional constraint was that Charles could not publicly acknowledge making strategic calculation to abandon Joan without appearing to reject the divine mission that legitimated his crown.

The solution was institutional passivity. Charles made no serious ransom effort but also issued no public repudiation. He maintained institutional silence while Joan faced trial and execution, neither defending nor condemning her. This passivity preserved the institutional narrative—Joan's mission had been divinely ordained, her coronation of Charles was legitimate—while allowing elite interests to prevail over figurehead protection. The institutional framework enabled this by separating Charles's sacral authority (derived from Joan's mission) from his political decisions (abandoning her to execution).

The later rehabilitation trial of 1456 demonstrates how institutional mechanisms could retrospectively adjust narratives to serve evolved elite interests. By the 1450s, Charles had consolidated power and expelled English forces from France. The heresy conviction no longer served any political purpose and indeed undermined legitimacy of Charles's reign by association with condemned heretic. The rehabilitation trial, initiated by Charles, deployed the same institutional apparatus—church investigation, theological examination, documentary evidence—to reverse the previous verdict.

The rehabilitation proceedings declared Joan innocent of heresy, pronounced her a martyr, and condemned the original trial as partisan political persecution. This institutional reversal served multiple elite purposes: it retrospectively validated Charles's coronation by affirming divine authenticity of Joan's mission, it delegitimized English occupation by emphasizing their execution of holy virgin, and it created foundation for Joan as national symbol useful for future political mobilization. The same institutional frameworks that had convicted her now sanctified her, demonstrating that legal and theological procedures serve power rather than truth.

IV. WEALTH EXTRACTION MECHANISMS: SACRED MOBILIZATION AS ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE

Taxation and Sacred Legitimation

The most direct wealth extraction benefit from Joan's narrative was enhanced capacity for royal taxation. Prior to the coronation, Charles VII's taxation authority was contested and limited. The Treaty of Troyes had recognized Henry VI of England and France as legitimate monarch, making Charles's tax demands legally questionable in territories under Anglo-Burgundian control or influence. Even in territories nominally loyal to Charles, his unconsecrated status limited ability to impose taxation without consent from local assemblies or representative bodies.

Joan's narrative transformed this situation by providing sacred legitimation for royal extraction. The coronation at Reims, achieved through Joan's divinely guided campaign, established Charles as legitimate king anointed by God. This theological validation supported legal claims to taxation rights: subjects owed taxes to their divinely appointed monarch as both legal obligation and religious duty. Resistance to royal taxation became not merely political disagreement but

theological transgression—refusal to support God's anointed king in sacred mission to expel heretical invaders.

The practical effects were substantial. Towns and territories that submitted to Charles after the coronation began paying royal taxes that had previously been withheld or paid to Anglo-Burgundian authorities. The taille—direct royal tax on commoners—became more enforceable when framed as support for divinely mandated defense of France. Indirect taxes on trade, salt, and other commodities generated increased revenue as economic activity resumed in pacified territories. The sacred narrative reduced enforcement costs: populations more willing to pay taxes when belief systems made payment appear religiously necessary rather than merely legally compelled.

Documentary evidence from the period shows royal tax revenue increasing significantly after the coronation. The royal chancery issued expanded taxation demands justified by necessity of defending the kingdom—necessity made more compelling by framing the conflict as sacred mission rather than dynastic dispute. Local officials reported improved tax compliance in territories where Joan's narrative had penetrated popular consciousness. The belief-based legitimation multiplied extraction capacity beyond what coercive enforcement alone could achieve.

The taxation infrastructure also benefited noble elites beyond the crown. Local lords collected seigneurial taxes from their own territories, often framing these demands as contributions to the sacred defense of France. The divine mandate narrative provided cover for extraction by multiple elite levels: royal taxation for the king's armies, seigneurial taxation for local defense, ecclesiastical taxation for church support of the war effort. The shared sacred framework enabled coordinated extraction without requiring explicit elite coordination—each level of hierarchy could invoke divine necessity independently.

Military Service and Unpaid Labor Extraction

Beyond direct taxation, Joan's narrative enabled extraction of military service at below-market rates or without compensation. Medieval warfare typically required either feudal service (vassals owing limited military obligation to lords) or paid mercenaries (professional soldiers receiving wages). Both systems had extraction limits: feudal service was time-limited and often contested, while mercenary service was expensive and their loyalty unstable without regular payment.

Joan's divine mandate narrative created third option: volunteers fighting for sacred cause who accepted lower compensation or no compensation because belief systems made sacrifice appear religiously meritorious rather than economically exploitative. French soldiers who believed they served God's chosen instrument were willing to endure hardships, accept delayed or reduced pay, and maintain service beyond contractual obligations because the cause transcended material calculation.

This belief-based mobilization represented massive wealth transfer from common populations to elite warfare objectives. Soldiers who would demand substantial wages to fight for noble

territorial ambitions accepted minimal or delayed compensation to fight for divinely ordained mission. Families who would resist conscription for dynastic wars supplied sons for sacred defense of France. Communities that would object to forced military provisioning contributed supplies willingly when framed as support for holy cause.

The economic value of this extraction was substantial. Maintaining field armies required enormous expenditure on wages, equipment, provisions, and transport. Joan's narrative reduced these costs by making soldiers willing to serve for less pay, accept worse conditions, and maintain morale despite hardships. The force multiplier was not just psychological (soldiers fighting harder) but economic (armies maintained at lower cost). This enabled Charles to field larger forces for longer campaigns than his actual treasury resources would otherwise allow.

The extraction mechanism operated through belief infrastructure rather than coercive enforcement. Soldiers volunteered because they believed in divine mission, not because conscription officers compelled them. Families supported military service because religious authorities preached it as sacred duty, not because royal officials threatened punishment. Communities contributed provisions because the cause appeared divinely mandated, not because extraction officers enforced quotas. The belief system transformed exploitation into voluntary sacrifice, eliminating resistance and enforcement costs.

Contemporary chronicles document this dynamic. Accounts describe soldiers rallying to Charles's banner after hearing of Joan's divine mission, accepting service terms they had previously rejected. Reports note improved military morale and reduced desertion rates when Joan accompanied forces. Letters from commanders emphasize how her presence enabled recruitment and retention that material incentives alone could not achieve. The narrative infrastructure functioned as wealth extraction mechanism by making populations willing to transfer labor value to elite military objectives at minimal cost.

Territorial Consolidation and Resource Control

Joan's military campaigns enabled territorial consolidation that expanded elite extraction bases. Each town or region that submitted to Charles brought its economic resources—agricultural production, commercial trade, tax revenue, military manpower—under control of elites loyal to his faction. The campaigns from Orléans to Reims and subsequent operations consolidated territorial bloc substantially larger than what Charles controlled before Joan's emergence.

The siege relief at Orléans itself had direct economic implications. Orléans was major commercial center controlling crucial Loire crossing and serving as gateway to Charles's southern territories. Its capture by English forces would have severed Charles's economic base, eliminating access to revenue from Languedoc and southern regions. The relief preserved this economic infrastructure, maintaining elite extraction rights over wealthy territories that sustained Charles's faction.

The campaign to Reims resulted in submission of multiple towns—Jargeau, Meung-sur-Loire, Beaugency, Troyes, Châlons-en-Champagne, Reims itself—each bringing economic assets

under Charles's control. These were not merely symbolic acquisitions but revenue-generating territories. Urban centers contributed commercial taxes, wealthy merchants could be pressured for loans, surrounding agricultural regions provided food supplies and tax base. Each territorial addition multiplied elite wealth extraction capacity.

The sacred narrative facilitated these submissions by reducing siege costs and civilian resistance. Towns faced with choice between prolonged siege (destructive and expensive) and submission to divinely mandated king often chose submission, especially when populations believed resistance opposed God's will. The belief infrastructure made territorial consolidation more efficient: fewer resources spent on siege warfare, less destruction of economic infrastructure, faster integration of new territories into extraction systems.

Post-submission economic integration reveals elite coordination around wealth extraction. Royal officials immediately established tax collection, judicial authority, and military recruitment in newly controlled territories. Local elites who collaborated received confirmation of privileges and property rights, buying their participation in new extraction arrangements. Church authorities provided theological legitimation for new political order, receiving ecclesiastical revenues and appointments in exchange. The territorial consolidation created expanded economic base from which multiple elite levels extracted wealth.

Plunder, Pillage, and Sanctioned Extraction

Military campaigns provided direct wealth extraction through plunder and ransom—traditional mechanisms of medieval warfare that Joan's sacred narrative made more extensive and legitimate. When French forces captured English-held towns or defeated English armies, soldiers expected plunder rights and commanders expected ransom payments for noble prisoners. Joan's divine mandate framework transformed this customary pillage into religiously sanctioned wealth transfer.

The theological justification was straightforward: English forces occupied French territory illegitimately, their presence constituted heretical invasion, therefore seizure of their property represented righteous recovery of stolen goods rather than mere plunder. This framing made pillage appear as divine justice rather than simple theft, reducing moral constraints on extraction and enabling more systematic seizure of wealth from occupied populations.

The Battle of Patay exemplifies this dynamic. French forces captured numerous English nobles whose ransoms represented substantial wealth transfers. By custom, captors received ransom payments, with portions distributed to commanders and the crown. Joan's presence framed these captures not as profit-taking but as divine judgment against heretical invaders, making the wealth extraction appear as God's will rather than mercenary calculation. The sacred narrative increased both the scale of ransom demands (justified by righteousness of cause) and compliance with those demands (avoiding appearance of opposing divine justice).

Beyond formal military engagement, the campaigns enabled extraction from occupied populations. As French forces advanced through contested territories, they could demand

provisions, accommodation, transport, and supplies from local populations, framing these demands as necessary support for divinely mandated liberation. The sacred narrative reduced resistance: populations more willing to provide resources to forces claiming divine mission than to obviously predatory armies.

The economic scale of military plunder was substantial. Captured towns yielded bullion, valuable goods, weapons, and supplies. Ransomed nobles transferred wealth from English and Burgundian aristocracy to French captors. Occupied populations contributed food, fodder, and services that would otherwise require payment from military budgets. All this wealth flowed into elite coffers—directly to noble commanders and soldiers, indirectly to the crown through shares of plunder and ransom. The belief infrastructure legitimated and amplified this extraction by transforming it from criminal pillage into sacred recovery of wrongfully held resources.

Elite Economic Coordination and Benefit Distribution

The wealth extraction enabled by Joan's narrative benefited multiple elite constituencies, requiring coordination to maintain the appropriation without destructive conflict over spoils. Royal officials, military commanders, landed nobility, church hierarchy, and urban commercial elites all gained from the campaigns, but potential existed for conflict over distribution of economic benefits.

The royal treasury received increased taxation revenue from expanded controlled territory and improved compliance in existing territories. Charles personally benefited from enhanced extraction capacity as anointed monarch with strengthened legal authority. Royal officials received appointments, land grants, and commercial privileges rewarding their service and ensuring continued loyalty. The crown's share of military plunder and ransom provided direct wealth infusion beyond regular taxation.

Military commanders gained through plunder and ransom rights. Nobles like Dunois, La Hire, and others who led Joan-associated campaigns captured English nobles whose ransoms represented fortunes. They seized goods and properties in captured towns. They received grants of confiscated lands from defeated or executed English collaborators. The military campaigns transformed these commanders from debt-burdened warriors into wealthy magnates whose economic position depended on continued success of Charles's cause.

Landed nobility benefited from territorial consolidation that secured their local extraction rights against English or Burgundian competition. Lords in contested regions faced uncertainty about whether they could maintain taxation and seigneurial rights if English forces prevailed; Charles's victories guaranteed their position. Additionally, loyalist nobles received confiscated properties from Burgundian collaborators who fled or were executed, expanding their economic bases.

The church hierarchy gained ecclesiastical revenues from expanded territories, appointments to wealthy benefices, and influence over newly submissive populations. Bishops and abbots who supported Charles received control over lucrative church positions. The validation of Joan's divine mission enhanced church authority by demonstrating God's intervention in human affairs,

strengthening theological claims that reinforced church extraction rights (tithes, offerings, bequests).

Urban commercial elites benefited from warfare's end and territorial consolidation that enabled resumed trade. Merchants in Orléans and other liberated cities gained from reopened trade routes and eliminated Anglo-Burgundian commercial competitors. Charles granted commercial privileges and monopolies to cities that submitted, enriching local economic elites in exchange for political and financial support.

This benefit distribution required elite coordination to prevent destructive competition. The institutional frameworks described earlier—legal structures, command hierarchies, ecclesiastical authorities—provided coordination mechanisms. Unwritten but understood conventions governed plunder distribution, ransom shares, and property confiscation. Elite networks of family relations, feudal obligations, and patronage ties mediated disputes and ensured spoils were distributed in ways that maintained coalition cohesion.

The coordination reveals elite consciousness of collective interests transcending individual greed. While each faction sought maximum benefit, all recognized that breaking elite unity would enable English reconquest, eliminating everyone's extraction capacity. The shared sacred narrative helped coordinate this restraint: because the cause appeared divinely mandated rather than merely acquisitive, elites could frame self-limitation as pious duty rather than weak bargaining position.

Long-Term Economic Consequences of Sacred Mobilization

The wealth extraction mechanisms enabled by Joan's narrative had enduring economic effects beyond immediate campaign results. The territorial consolidation and strengthened royal authority created foundation for more systematic extraction infrastructure that persisted after Joan's death and throughout Charles VII's reign.

The improved taxation capacity enabled Charles to maintain standing military forces—professional soldiers paid regular wages rather than temporary feudal levies or unreliable mercenaries. This military permanence represented wealth transfer from general population (through taxation) to professional military class (through wages) that would not have been sustainable without enhanced extraction mechanisms. The standing army itself became tool for protecting and expanding elite extraction rights against internal and external threats.

The economic infrastructure of Joan's campaigns established patterns of resource mobilization that became institutionalized. The combination of royal taxation, military requisitions, and voluntary contributions created precedent for state capacity to extract resources for "national" purposes—precedent that future French monarchs would invoke to justify expanded taxation and centralized control. The sacred legitimation transformed what might have been temporary wartime extraction into permanent state power.

The wealth transfers enriched specific elite families and factions whose descendants would dominate French politics and economy for generations. The commanders who prospered from Joan's campaigns—their plunder, ransoms, and land grants—established family fortunes that enabled their lineages to maintain elite status through subsequent centuries. The economic stratification created by wartime extraction persisted long after military necessity ended.

The pattern demonstrates how belief-based mobilization functions as wealth extraction infrastructure. Joan's narrative did not merely inspire soldiers or legitimate Charles's kingship—it enabled systematic transfer of economic resources from common populations to elite constituencies through mechanisms that would have been more expensive, less efficient, or politically impossible without sacred framing. The beliefs were real, the mobilization was genuine, but the economic function was extraction regardless of theological validity.

V. INFORMATION CONTROL: MANAGING THE SACRED NARRATIVE

Chronicle Production and Elite Narrative Management

The Joan of Arc narrative that reached contemporary French populations was not unmediated historical record but carefully constructed account produced by chronicle writers dependent on elite patronage. The major chronicles describing Joan's campaigns—by Jean Chartier, Perceval de Cagny, the Journal of the Siege of Orléans, and others—were written by clerics and officials in Charles VII's service or by authors seeking favor from the triumphant Valois faction. This patronage structure ensured chronicles emphasized elements serving elite interests while suppressing details threatening to desired narrative.

Jean Chartier, Charles VII's official historiographer and monk at Saint-Denis, produced extensive chronicle emphasizing Joan's divine mission, Charles's rightful kingship, and French victories as manifestations of God's judgment. Chartier had direct access to royal court, attended councils, and witnessed key events, but his accounts reflect royal perspective: Joan appears as divinely sent instrument whose mission validates Charles's authority, military victories demonstrate God's favor, and eventual French triumph proves theological correctness of Charles's cause. Alternative interpretations—that strategic factors determined outcomes, that elite calculation deployed Joan instrumentally, that material conditions rather than divine intervention drove events—are absent.

The Journal of the Siege of Orléans, written by an anonymous author probably connected to the city government, provides detailed account of the siege's relief while framing it as miraculous intervention. The journal describes Joan's arrival, her inspirational effect on troops, and French victories in explicitly supernatural terms: God sent the Maid to save France, her prophecies proved divine foreknowledge, English defeats demonstrated God's judgment against heretical invaders. The materialist details—specific military tactics, force deployments, English command

failures, favorable strategic circumstances—receive less emphasis than theological interpretation.

Perceval de Cagny, writing as squire to the Duke of Alençon who commanded forces during Joan's campaigns, produces chronicle emphasizing her divine guidance and aristocratic support for her mission. Cagny's account validates noble participation in Joan's campaigns by framing them as response to divine imperative rather than political calculation. This served elite interests: nobles who might appear opportunistic for abandoning previous English allegiances could claim they were merely following God's revealed will through Joan.

These chronicles share common narrative structures that reveal coordinated elite management: Joan's peasant origins are emphasized to highlight divine intervention's miraculous nature (God working through unlikely instrument), her virginity and piety are stressed to establish theological legitimacy (pure vessel for divine communication), her military successes are attributed to supernatural agency (proof of divine mission), and her personal holiness is contrasted with English impiety (theological justification for French cause). These repeated themes across multiple sources suggest not independent witnesses all arriving at similar conclusions but coordinated narrative construction.

The production mechanism itself ensured elite control. Chronicles were expensive to produce—requiring parchment, trained scribes, illuminators for decorated manuscripts, and resources for copying and distribution. Only wealthy patrons (king, nobles, church institutions, urban governments) could commission such works. Chronicles were written in Latin or formal French, limiting readership to educated elites and clergy. They were not mass media but elite communications designed to establish authoritative historical record that would shape future interpretation of events.

Ecclesiastical Information Networks

The church hierarchy provided essential infrastructure for disseminating and validating Joan's narrative to general populations. Bishops, priests, and friars controlled access to religious interpretation for populations who received information primarily through sermons, religious festivals, and ecclesiastical pronouncements. The church's validation of Joan's divine mission—established through Poitiers examination and reinforced through subsequent ecclesiastical support—meant local priests throughout French territories preached about her as authentic divine instrument.

Sermons provided primary information channel to illiterate populations. Sunday mass attendance was near-universal, making church the only institution regularly communicating with entire population. Priests who supported Charles's cause preached about Joan as God's chosen vessel to expel the English, framed French military campaigns as sacred mission, and presented submission to Charles as religious duty. The theological framing transformed political messaging into spiritual guidance that populations were culturally conditioned to accept without critical evaluation.

The preaching infrastructure extended beyond parish priests to include mendicant friars—Franciscans and Dominicans—who traveled between communities preaching and hearing confessions. These mobile preachers spread Joan's narrative across wider territories than settled parish clergy, carrying accounts of her divine mission, her miraculous victories, and her sacred purpose to expel heretics. The friars' reputation for poverty and piety lent credibility to their messages, making populations more receptive to narratives they promoted.

Religious festivals and celebrations provided occasions for elaborate theatrical presentations of Joan's narrative. The relief of Orléans, for example, was commemorated annually with religious processions, dramatic reenactments, and special masses that reinforced the divine intervention interpretation. These celebrations embedded Joan's story in community religious culture, transmitting it to subsequent generations as sacred history rather than mere political events. Children growing up with annual festivals celebrating Joan's divinely guided victories internalized the narrative as unquestionable religious truth.

The ecclesiastical information network also functioned as suppression mechanism for alternative interpretations. Priests who questioned Joan's divine mission risked accusations of heresy or disloyalty. Theologians who suggested materialist explanations for French victories found their arguments excluded from pulpits and religious texts. The church's institutional authority to define orthodox belief meant dissenting interpretations could be marginalized as theological error rather than legitimate alternative perspectives.

Evidence of this ecclesiastical coordination appears in synod records, episcopal letters, and monastic chronicles. Bishops issued pastoral letters instructing priests to preach about Joan's divine mission. Monastic scribes produced vitae (saint's lives) presenting Joan in hagiographic terms even before formal canonization. University theologians produced treatises defending her divine commission against skeptics. This coordinated intellectual production reveals conscious elite management of theological interpretation to serve political narrative.

Controlling Opposition and Alternative Narratives

The French elite's appropriation of Joan's narrative required not just promoting desired interpretation but suppressing alternatives that might undermine strategic utility. Three main alternative narratives threatened the official account: English/Burgundian counter-narrative portraying Joan as witch or heretic, skeptical materialist interpretation attributing victories to conventional military factors, and theological doubt questioning divine origin of her visions.

The English and Burgundian counter-narrative, most forcefully articulated during Joan's trial, claimed her visions originated from demonic deception rather than divine revelation. This interpretation served obvious political purposes: it delegitimated French victories (achieved through satanic agency), undermined Charles's coronation (accomplished through heretical instrumentality), and justified English occupation (defending Christendom against diabolic forces). The University of Paris, under Anglo-Burgundian control, provided theological validation for this interpretation, declaring Joan's male dress, direct divine claims, and resistance to church authority constituted heresy.

French elites combated this counter-narrative through coordinated information campaigns emphasizing church validation from Poitiers, Joan's evident piety and virginity, and French military successes as proof of divine favor. The rehabilitation trial of 1456 institutionalized this counter-campaign, systematically refuting each element of the heresy charges and declaring Joan innocent. This was not dispassionate truth-seeking but strategic narrative warfare: delegitimating English interpretation while validating French elite appropriation of Joan's story.

The materialist interpretation—that French victories resulted from favorable strategic circumstances, competent military leadership, and English command failures rather than divine intervention—received less explicit attention because it did not organize around institutions or prominent spokespersons. However, evidence suggests some contemporaries recognized material factors. Chronicles mention specific tactical decisions, force dispositions, and battlefield circumstances even while framing outcomes theologically. Some commanders' letters discuss operations in practical military terms without supernatural references.

Elite management suppressed materialist interpretation not through direct censorship but through monopolizing legitimate interpretation channels. Official chronicles framed events theologically. Church sermons attributed outcomes to divine agency. Royal pronouncements emphasized sacred mission. The cumulative effect was to make materialist explanation appear not just incorrect but impious—suggesting that recognizing human agency somehow denied God's sovereignty. This theological framing made materialist interpretation difficult to articulate without appearing to challenge religious authority.

Theological doubt about Joan's visions—questioning whether she genuinely heard voices or suffered delusion—posed threat to narrative utility. If Joan was merely mentally ill, her mission lacked divine sanction and Charles's coronation lost theological validation. French elites managed this doubt by emphasizing church examination results: trained theologians had investigated and certified her visions as authentic, making further questioning appear as theological disobedience rather than legitimate skepticism.

The management of doubt also operated through witness testimony and documentary evidence. Collections of miracles attributed to Joan's intercession, accounts of her prophecies being fulfilled, and testimonies of her piety and supernatural knowledge created cumulative case for divine mission that made doubt seem unreasonable. Whether these accounts accurately represented events or were constructed to serve narrative purposes becomes secondary to their function: creating information environment where accepted interpretation appeared as obvious truth rather than contested claim.

Geographic Information Control

Joan's narrative spread unevenly across French territories, with concentration in regions where elite interests favored its promotion and suppression in areas under English or Burgundian control. This geographic variation reveals how information control operated through political power rather than mere factual accuracy.

In Charles's core territories—Orléans, the Loire valley, and southern regions—Joan's narrative saturated popular consciousness through all available channels. Royal officials promoted it, priests preached it, chronicles documented it, festivals celebrated it. Populations in these areas heard consistent message: Joan was divinely sent to save France, her mission validated Charles's kingship, supporting her campaigns constituted religious duty. The repetition and coordination created what appeared as consensus but was actually managed information environment.

In contested border regions, information warfare was explicit. English and Burgundian authorities promoted counter-narrative about Joan as witch while French agents spread accounts of her divine mission and miraculous victories. Populations received contradictory messages depending on which faction controlled their locality or which side's propaganda networks reached them. This created regional variation in belief: some communities accepted Joan as saint, others as heretic, depending on which elite faction controlled their information access.

In English-controlled territories like Normandy and Paris, Joan's narrative was systematically suppressed. The University of Paris, Europe's premier theological authority, officially condemned her. English officials prohibited public discussion of her divine mission. When these territories eventually submitted to Charles, populations had to be reeducated through intensive preaching campaigns emphasizing her sanctity and Charles's legitimate authority. This demonstrates that narrative acceptance required not just compelling story but institutional power to control information channels.

The geographic information control extended beyond France to European courts where diplomatic implications of Joan's narrative mattered. Charles's agents sent ambassadors to spread accounts of divine intervention validating his cause, seeking recognition from other monarchs and church authorities. English diplomats countered with evidence from the heresy trial. This international information warfare reveals elite consciousness that narrative control was strategic resource worth diplomatic effort.

Oral Transmission and Popular Belief

While elite chronicles and ecclesiastical institutions controlled formal information channels, oral transmission through popular culture created additional narrative layer beyond direct elite management. Soldiers who witnessed Joan's campaigns told stories to families and communities. Merchants traveling trade routes spread accounts between cities. Pilgrims visiting religious sites carried narratives across regions. This oral tradition could amplify, distort, or resist official narratives in ways elites could not entirely control.

However, oral transmission generally reinforced rather than challenged elite-promoted narrative because populations lacked framework for materialist interpretation. When soldiers described French victories at Orléans or Patay, their accounts emphasized Joan's inspirational presence and prophecies fulfilled rather than tactical details because that's what seemed causally important to them. When priests preached divine mission and soldiers confirmed miraculous

elements, mutual reinforcement between ecclesiastical and popular transmission created self-validating narrative cycle.

The oral tradition also incorporated legendary elements that further sacralized Joan's story. Accounts of prophecies she never made, miracles she didn't perform, and supernatural knowledge she didn't possess circulated and became attached to her narrative. These legendary accretions actually served elite interests: the more miraculous Joan appeared, the stronger the theological validation of Charles's cause. While elites might not directly create these legends, they benefited from and encouraged them through selective validation and incorporation into official accounts.

The examination of witnesses during the rehabilitation trial provides evidence of how oral transmission preserved and enhanced sacred narrative. Witnesses twenty-five years after Joan's death recalled events in explicitly miraculous terms, likely shaped by decades of religious commemoration and legendary elaboration. Their testimonies, collected by church officials seeking to overturn heresy conviction, became official documentary record validating divine mission interpretation. The process demonstrates how oral tradition, ecclesiastical validation, and elite strategic interests mutually reinforced coherent sacred narrative.

The Trial Record as Information Control

Joan's trial transcript, ironically, became one of most detailed sources for her life and claims while simultaneously serving English information control purposes. The trial record was carefully produced by pro-English and Burgundian clerics to document heresy conviction and justify execution. However, its detailed interrogation of Joan's claims, her responses under pressure, and theological arguments deployed against her created documentary resource that could be (and was) later appropriated for opposite purposes.

The English and Burgundian elites who commissioned the trial record intended it to serve as authoritative proof of Joan's heresy, legitimating her execution and delegitimating French victories achieved through her agency. The document meticulously recorded charges, testimony, interrogations, and final conviction, creating legal and theological record that could be circulated to validate English interpretation. This was information control through documentation: creating official record that would shape historical understanding in England's favor.

However, the trial record preserved Joan's own testimony about her visions, her mission, and her convictions in remarkable detail. Her refusal to submit to church authority, her insistence on divine revelation, and her steadfast maintenance of male dress under threat of death became evidence of both heresy (from English perspective) and sanctity (from later French rehabilitation perspective). The same document served opposite narrative purposes depending on interpretive framework applied.

The rehabilitation trial of 1456 systematically reinterpreted the original trial record to serve Charles VII's interests. Church officials examined the transcript, identified procedural violations

and coerced testimony, and declared the conviction invalid. This created second documentary layer: official record declaring that first official record was fraudulent political persecution rather than legitimate theological judgment. The ability to reinterpret existing documents for new elite purposes demonstrates that control over official records provides enduring power to shape historical narrative.

Suppression After Capture

Joan's capture at Compiègne in May 1430 created information control crisis for French elites. A divinely guided instrument of God should not be captured by heretical enemies—the event suggested either that divine protection had failed or that Joan's mission was completed or that she had somehow sinned to lose divine favor. Each interpretation threatened narrative utility, requiring careful management.

The initial French elite response was informational silence. Charles VII issued no public statements about Joan's capture or imprisonment. Royal chronicles minimized the event's significance or framed it as part of divine plan incomprehensible to humans. This silence prevented drawing attention to theological problems raised by her capture while allowing time to assess how situation would develop. The information vacuum was itself strategic choice: saying nothing was safer than attempting to explain apparent divine abandonment.

During Joan's imprisonment and trial, French elites had limited capacity for direct information control in English-held territory but could manage interpretation in their own regions. Priests in Charles's territories preached that Joan's capture was temporary trial by God, that her suffering paralleled Christ's passion, and that divine vindication would ultimately come. This framing transformed potential theological crisis into opportunity for hagiographic development: Joan as martyr suffering for righteous cause rather than as failed prophet abandoned by God.

When Joan was executed in May 1431, French information control faced most severe challenge. The English had successfully prosecuted and burned her as heretic, creating official church record of condemnation. If this verdict stood unchallenged, it delegitimated Charles's coronation and French military campaigns achieved through condemned heretic's agency. The French elite response combined short-term silence with long-term rehabilitation strategy: avoid immediate confrontation over the verdict while planning eventual systematic refutation through church procedures.

The information control strategy reveals elite consciousness that narrative management required patience and institutional leverage rather than immediate confrontation. Charles could not militarily or politically force English authorities to reverse the verdict in 1431. But he could ensure that within territories he controlled, alternative interpretation—Joan as martyred saint—continued to circulate. And he could plan for eventual rehabilitation once political circumstances allowed, which occurred twenty-five years later when English forces had been expelled and Charles controlled sufficient church authority to commission reversal.

[End of Part 2]

Part 3 will examine: The final sections of Information Control (post-execution narrative management), Resistance and Suppression (Joan's disposal and the trial as suppression mechanism), and Elite Network Coordination (how diverse elite factions maintained cohesion around the appropriation).

Joan of Arc: Sacred Figurehead and Elite Power Consolidation in the Hundred Years' War (1428-1431)

Part 3 of 4: Information Control (Continued), Resistance and Suppression, and Elite Coordination

---

V. INFORMATION CONTROL (CONTINUED): POST-EXECUTION NARRATIVE MANAGEMENT

The Immediate Aftermath: Strategic Silence and Competing Interpretations

Joan's execution on May 30, 1431, in the marketplace at Rouen created immediate information control challenge for both English and French elites. The English had successfully prosecuted and burned a woman who claimed divine mission, creating permanent record of church-sanctioned heresy conviction. The French had lost their most powerful symbolic figure while she remained in enemy hands. Each faction needed to manage interpretation of her death to serve their respective political interests.

The English information strategy emphasized legitimacy of the trial and righteousness of the execution. Official English pronouncements and chronicles described Joan as relapsed heretic whose conviction by learned theologians and legitimate church procedures proved her diabolical nature. Letters were sent to European courts explaining that England had defended Christendom against satanic deception. The University of Paris issued theological opinions validating the trial's conclusions. This coordinated information campaign sought to establish execution as religious duty rather than political murder.

The strategic purpose was clear: delegitimate Charles VII's coronation by proving it was achieved through heretical instrumentality. If Joan was demon-possessed witch, then Charles's anointing was spiritually invalid, his kingship lacked divine sanction, and his claim to throne remained legally questionable. The English needed Joan's heresy to be accepted as theological truth because their political legitimacy in France depended on Charles's illegitimacy.

French elite response required more subtle information management. Charles VII could not immediately challenge the verdict without appearing to question church authority—the same ecclesiastical legitimacy that validated his own coronation. Direct confrontation risked theological crisis: either the church at Poitiers erred in validating Joan (undermining Charles's

legitimation) or the church at Rouen erred in condemning her (suggesting church fallibility). Neither option served French interests in 1431.

The solution was strategic ambiguity. Charles issued no official statement about Joan's execution, neither defending her sanctity nor accepting her heresy. Royal chronicles minimized discussion of her death or framed it in vague theological terms about God's mysterious purposes. Priests in Charles's territories continued preaching about her divine mission but avoided directly challenging Rouen verdict. This informational silence prevented drawing attention to theological contradictions while preserving possibility of future rehabilitation when political circumstances changed.

However, popular sentiment in French territories loyal to Charles did not accept the heresy conviction. Oral tradition and local religious practice maintained Joan as martyr-saint regardless of official church pronouncement. Communities that had witnessed her campaigns, soldiers who had fought beside her, and populations that had heard priests preach her divine mission could not be convinced by English theological arguments that she was demon-possessed. This popular resistance to official narrative demonstrates limits of information control: when populations have direct experience contradicting elite messaging, belief infrastructure resists manipulation.

The Rehabilitation Trial: Institutional Reversal as Information Control

The rehabilitation trial initiated by Charles VII in 1452 and concluded in 1456 represents systematic deployment of institutional mechanisms to reverse narrative. By the 1450s, political circumstances had transformed: English forces had been expelled from France except Calais, Charles controlled vast majority of French territory, Burgundy had reconciled with France through Treaty of Arras (1435), and Charles's kingship was no longer contested. The heresy conviction that had served English interests now served no one's purposes and undermined French national mythology.

Charles petitioned Pope Calixtus III to investigate the trial, claiming procedural irregularities and coerced testimony. The papal commission, headed by French ecclesiastical authorities loyal to Charles, spent years collecting testimony from witnesses, examining trial records, and constructing case for Joan's innocence. This was not dispassionate truth-seeking but strategic deployment of church procedures to produce desired verdict: Joan was innocent martyr, original trial was political persecution, and her divine mission was authentic.

The rehabilitation proceedings reveal elite consciousness of narrative as strategic resource. The commission did not merely reverse the verdict but systematically refuted each element of original condemnation. They identified procedural violations (Joan denied counsel, pressured under threat of torture, held in secular rather than ecclesiastical prison). They collected testimony emphasizing her piety, virginity, and orthodox beliefs. They obtained statements from soldiers and civilians describing her miraculous knowledge and prophetic accuracy. They demonstrated that judges at Rouen were politically compromised partisans rather than impartial theologians.

The final decree in July 1456 declared Joan innocent of all charges, pronounced her a martyr who died defending the faith, ordered public posting of the rehabilitation verdict, and directed that her name be cleared of all heresy accusations. This institutional reversal accomplished multiple elite objectives simultaneously. It validated Charles's coronation retrospectively by confirming that Joan's mission was genuinely divine. It delegitimated English occupation by emphasizing their execution of holy virgin. It created foundation myth for French national identity centered on innocent maiden martyred by foreign invaders. Most critically, it demonstrated elite capacity to control official narrative through institutional authority regardless of factual complexity.

The rehabilitation reveals patterns of how information control operates through institutions. The same church procedures that convicted Joan in 1431 exonerated her in 1456—not because new evidence emerged but because different elites controlled the examining authorities. The theological questions remained identical: did Joan's visions come from God or devil, did her male dress constitute heresy, should she have submitted to church hierarchy? The answers reversed because elite interests changed, demonstrating that institutional truth-finding serves power rather than transcendent justice.

Creating the Saint: Long-Term Narrative Construction

The centuries following rehabilitation witnessed systematic construction of Joan as national saint through coordinated elite appropriation of her narrative for successive political purposes. Each generation of French elites discovered new strategic utility in Joan's story, deploying it to legitimate authority, mobilize populations, and reinforce national mythology. This long-term narrative evolution demonstrates that belief infrastructure, once established, becomes permanent resource available for repeated appropriation.

During the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, French monarchy appropriated Joan's narrative to legitimate royal authority against internal and external challenges. When French kings faced noble rebellions or foreign invasions, official propaganda invoked Joan's divine mandate to demonstrate God's continued favor for French monarchy. Her story proved that God intervened in French affairs, that humble subjects should obey divinely appointed kings, and that France possessed sacred destiny requiring unity under royal leadership. The narrative reinforced monarchical absolutism by suggesting that resistance to crown opposed God's ordained order.

The Protestant Reformation created new opportunity for Joan's appropriation. Catholic authorities emphasized her submission to church, her orthodox beliefs validated by ecclesiastical examination, and her martyrdom at hands of English allied with heretical elements. Joan became symbol of Catholic orthodoxy against Protestant challenge, proving that humble faithful Catholics like her possessed divine favor while educated Protestant reformers represented prideful heresy. This appropriation served Counter-Reformation purposes by providing compelling indigenous French Catholic saint to compete with Protestant rejection of Catholic sanctification processes.

The French Revolution of 1789 required narrative adjustment but not abandonment. Revolutionary authorities initially rejected Joan as tool of monarchy and church, but quickly recognized her utility for revolutionary nationalism. Robespierre and others reframed Joan as champion of the people against aristocratic oppression and foreign invasion. Her peasant origins became proof that common people possessed inherent virtue and patriotic dedication superior to corrupt nobility. Her divine mission was secularized into patriotic destiny, transforming religious narrative into nationalist mythology suitable for revolutionary purposes.

Napoleon appropriated Joan's narrative to legitimate his rule and mobilize populations for imperial expansion. Napoleonic propaganda emphasized Joan's military genius, her transformation of French fortunes through individual will, and her embodiment of French greatness. The religious elements were downplayed while martial and nationalist themes received emphasis, making Joan suitable symbol for Napoleonic militarism and imperial ambitions. Schools taught Joan's story as lesson in patriotic sacrifice and French exceptionalism.

The nineteenth-century nationalist movements across Europe made Joan increasingly valuable as founding figure for French national identity. As Germany unified under Prussian leadership and threatened French security, Joan became symbol of resistance to German aggression. The Franco-Prussian War (1870-71) and subsequent loss of Alsace-Lorraine made Joan—from Lorraine borderlands—particularly resonant symbol. Right-wing nationalists emphasized her monarchism and Catholicism, left-wing republicans emphasized her popular origins and patriotic sacrifice, but all factions agreed she embodied essential French character worthy of emulation.

The twentieth century witnessed competing appropriations by fascist, communist, and liberal democratic factions. Vichy France under Nazi occupation claimed Joan as symbol of traditional Catholic France resisting foreign domination while collaborating with German occupiers—ideological gymnastics requiring complete separation of Joan narrative from its historical context. The French Resistance invoked Joan as symbol of patriotic struggle against occupation, emphasizing her military resistance to foreign invaders. De Gaulle's Free French appropriated her narrative to legitimate his authority as authentic voice of France against both Vichy collaboration and German occupation.

Each appropriation required narrative adjustment while preserving core elements. Joan's peasant origins could signify humble Catholic faithful (Counter-Reformation), virtuous common people (Revolution), martial French spirit (Napoleon), or popular resistance (twentieth century). Her military campaigns could exemplify divine intervention (monarchy), patriotic defense (nationalism), or anti-fascist resistance (World War II). Her martyrdom could prove Catholic sanctity, monarchical legitimacy, or nationalist sacrifice depending on appropriating faction's needs. The narrative infrastructure was sufficiently flexible to accommodate radically different political purposes while maintaining recognizability.

This centuries-long appropriation pattern demonstrates key principle: belief systems, once embedded in popular consciousness through elite promotion, become permanent cultural resources available for repeated deployment. French elites did not need to reinvent Joan's

narrative for each new crisis—they inherited cultural infrastructure created by fifteenth-century appropriation and adapted it to contemporary circumstances. The investment in narrative construction in 1429-1431 continued generating returns for elite power consolidation across six centuries.

Canonization: Ultimate Institutional Validation

Joan's formal canonization as saint by Pope Benedict XV in 1920 represented final institutional legitimation of the narrative construction begun in 1429. The canonization process, initiated in 1869 and requiring decades of ecclesiastical investigation, testimony collection, and theological evaluation, transformed Joan from nationally revered figure into universally recognized Catholic saint. This elevation to sainthood provided ultimate validation: God had indeed spoken through Joan, her mission was authentically divine, and her example was worthy of universal veneration.

The timing of canonization reveals political calculations. The late nineteenth century witnessed intense conflict between French Republic and Catholic Church over secularization, church property, and education. Republican governments implemented anticlerical policies that alienated Catholic populations and created political division. Joan's canonization offered opportunity for reconciliation: she was patriotic French figure acceptable to republicans and orthodox Catholic saint acceptable to church hierarchy. Making her universal saint unified French Catholics and nationalists around shared symbol.

The canonization also served international Catholic Church interests. World War I had recently ended, creating need for symbols of Christian virtue amidst unprecedented slaughter. Joan as military saint who died for faith provided compelling example of religious devotion in wartime. Her French origins allowed church to appeal to French Catholic populations while her universal sanctity transcended nationalism. The canonization reinforced church authority by demonstrating that ecclesiastical institutions remained capable of recognizing authentic sanctity and validating popular devotion.

The process reveals how institutional validation operates across centuries. The same church that executed Joan in 1431, rehabilitated her in 1456, and now canonized her in 1920 claimed consistent authority to determine theological truth. Each reversal of judgment—from heretic to martyr to saint—was presented not as institutional error but as proper procedure responding to new evidence or correcting previous procedural flaws. This narrative continuity obscures that theological conclusions changed to serve evolving political interests while institutional authority to make binding judgments remained constant.

The canonization created permanent religious infrastructure around Joan's narrative. Annual feast day (May 30, anniversary of her execution) requires liturgical commemoration in Catholic churches worldwide. Hagiographic texts and devotional materials proliferate. Churches and schools are named in her honor. Pilgrimage sites attract devotees. This institutionalized veneration ensures perpetual transmission of narrative across generations through church's educational and liturgical apparatus, making Joan's story permanent feature of Catholic culture regardless of political circumstances.

Information Control in Contemporary Context

Joan of Arc's narrative continues functioning as information control mechanism in contemporary France and beyond. Political factions across ideological spectrum appropriate her story to legitimate positions, mobilize supporters, and claim authentic French identity. Far-right nationalist parties invoke Joan to oppose immigration and defend traditional French culture. Feminist movements claim her as symbol of female empowerment and resistance to patriarchal authority. Military leaders cite her as embodiment of martial virtue and patriotic sacrifice. Each appropriation selectively emphasizes elements serving contemporary political purposes while suppressing contradictory details.

The sustained appropriability demonstrates the narrative's constructed flexibility. Historical Joan—illiterate peasant girl who heard voices, wore male clothing, and led military campaigns in service of dynastic struggle—gets transformed into whatever contemporary movements require: nationalist icon, feminist pioneer, religious mystic, military genius, or populist hero. This flexibility results from six centuries of successive reinterpretations that have layered meanings onto original events until historical reality becomes almost inaccessible beneath accumulated narrative constructions.

Contemporary information control around Joan operates through educational curricula, media representations, political rhetoric, and cultural commemorations. French schools teach Joan as founding figure of French national identity, emphasizing patriotic themes while downplaying religious fanaticism or political instrumentality. Films, novels, and theatrical productions present competing interpretations that reflect contemporary cultural concerns more than historical evidence. Politicians invoke her name in speeches to claim mantle of authentic French leadership. Museums and heritage sites curate her story to emphasize elements supporting current political consensus about French values.

The information control reveals that narrative infrastructure, once established, becomes self-perpetuating cultural resource requiring minimal active management. French populations inherit Joan's narrative through family transmission, school curricula, cultural exposure, and religious practice. Each generation internalizes the story as unquestionable historical fact and sacred national mythology. Elite management consists primarily of selective emphasis and contemporary framing rather than active suppression of alternatives—though alternative interpretations (such as materialist analysis emphasizing elite appropriation of belief systems) remain marginalized in mainstream discourse.

VI. RESISTANCE AND SUPPRESSION: THE DISPOSAL OF INCONVENIENT FIGUREHEADS

Joan's Growing Liability After Coronation

The transformation of Joan from strategic asset to political liability demonstrates the disposable nature of figureheads once they cease serving elite interests. After Charles VII's coronation at Reims in July 1429, the primary purpose of Joan's appropriation had been achieved: Charles possessed sacred legitimation through anointing, his kingship was theologically validated, and military momentum favored French cause. Joan's continued presence and divine mandate claims increasingly constrained elite decision-making rather than enabling it.

The failed assault on Paris in September 1429 marked the beginning of elite disengagement from unlimited deployment of Joan's narrative. Joan had advocated for attacking Paris, claiming divine instruction to drive the English from all French territory. From elite strategic perspective, Paris assault was militarily unwise: the city was heavily fortified, its population did not support Charles, and diplomatic negotiations with Burgundy offered potential advantages. However, Joan's insistence on divine mission to continue the war created political difficulty for refusing without appearing to reject God's will.

Charles and his military advisors authorized limited Paris assault primarily to test whether Joan's divine mandate narrative could overcome unfavorable material conditions. When the assault failed—French forces repelled, Joan wounded, no prospect of success—elite authorities gained evidence that belief-based mobilization had limits. Divine intervention narrative could not compensate for inadequate siege equipment, insufficient forces, hostile civilian population, and strong enemy defenses. This failure demonstrated that Joan was more useful as symbolic figure for operations that were militarily viable than as decision-maker claiming divine guidance for strategically questionable campaigns.

Following Paris failure, elite management of Joan shifted from active deployment to strategic containment. Charles created her a noble (granting her family patents of nobility) and encouraged her to retire from active campaigning. This elevation simultaneously rewarded her service and created honorable pretext for removing her from military operations. The ennoblement served dual purposes: it compensated Joan's family for her contributions while providing face-saving explanation for why peasant girl would no longer lead armies—she had been elevated above her station and could retire with honor.

Joan, however, refused containment. She continued insisting on military action based on divine instruction, claiming her voices commanded her to continue fighting until English were expelled. This persistence transformed her from useful instrument into constraining presence. Elite commanders could not simply ignore her without appearing to reject divine guidance, but following her instructions risked military disasters based on theological enthusiasm rather than strategic calculation. The theological legitimacy that made her valuable now limited elite autonomy.

The constraint was particularly acute because Joan's narrative had been so successfully promoted to common soldiers and populations. Troops believed in her divine mission and responded to her presence with extraordinary morale and dedication. Simply ordering her to cease military activities would demoralize forces and undermine the very belief infrastructure

that made her appropriation valuable. Elite management required subtle disengagement that preserved narrative utility while reducing Joan's actual influence over military decision-making.

The Capture at Compiègne: Convenient Elimination

Joan's capture by Burgundian forces at Compiègne on May 23, 1430, solved the elite management problem by removing her from French control while preserving plausible deniability about her abandonment. The capture occurred during a sortie from Compiègne when Burgundian forces surrounded Joan's company and the town gates closed before she could retreat. Whether the gate closure was accidental, result of panic, or deliberate betrayal remains disputed, but the strategic result was clear: Joan passed into enemy hands, eliminating her as constraint on French elite decision-making.

Charles VII's response—or rather, lack of response—reveals elite calculation about Joan's utility once captured. Despite possessing resources to attempt ransom, Charles made no serious effort to secure her release. The ransom would have been substantial but not impossible—other noble prisoners were regularly ransomed during the Hundred Years' War through negotiated payments. Charles had previously ransomed other captured commanders whose military value justified the expense. Joan's capture created precedent for negotiation if Charles had deemed her recovery worth the cost.

The absence of ransom effort demonstrates that Joan's strategic utility had expired. She had accomplished her primary purpose: legitimating Charles's coronation through divine mandate narrative. Her continued presence created constraints by advocating for military operations based on divine instruction rather than strategic calculation. Her capture by enemies provided convenient solution: she was removed from French operations without Charles appearing to reject her, and any theological problems raised by her capture (why would God allow divine instrument to be captured?) could be explained as mysterious divine purpose or test of faith.

The Burgundians, recognizing Joan's propaganda value, initially attempted to ransom her to Charles. Burgundian military leaders understood that Joan's capture represented major symbolic victory and that Charles might pay substantial sum for her return. The Burgundian offer, communicated through various intermediaries, received no response from Charles's court. This silence communicated elite decision: Joan was more useful to Charles as captured martyr than as liberated figurehead demanding continued military operations based on divine visions.

When Burgundian ransom offers failed, they sold Joan to the English for 10,000 livres tournois—substantial sum demonstrating English recognition of her symbolic importance. The English purchased her not to hold as prisoner for military intelligence or future negotiations but specifically to put her on trial for heresy. This English strategy reveals their understanding of belief infrastructure: they could not militarily defeat the divine mandate narrative while Joan remained alive and proclaiming her mission, but they could delegitimate it through theological conviction and execution.

Charles's continued inaction during Joan's English imprisonment demonstrates sustained elite calculation. During the year between capture and execution, Charles possessed both time and resources to attempt diplomatic intervention, prisoner exchange, or military rescue operation. Other nobles in similar circumstances received such efforts—Joan's abandonment was choice, not necessity. The decision reveals that elite management of figureheads depends on ongoing utility assessment: when figureheads cease serving interests or actively constrain elite autonomy, they become disposable regardless of their previous service or popular veneration.

The Trial as Suppression Mechanism

Joan's trial by the Inquisition, presided over by Pierre Cauchon (Bishop of Beauvais) and supported by English military and political authority, exemplifies how institutional mechanisms suppress challenges to elite power. The trial ostensibly investigated theological questions about Joan's visions, male dress, and submission to church authority, but functionally served English political objective: eliminating Joan as symbolic threat to English claims in France while delegitimating French victories achieved through her narrative.

The trial structure ensured the desired outcome through multiple mechanisms. Cauchon, though ecclesiastical authority, was politically aligned with English and Burgundian factions—he received English pension, operated under English military protection, and understood that his position depended on English victory in France. The trial format was inquisitorial rather than adversarial, giving prosecutors complete control over proceedings without possibility of defense counsel or appeal to higher church authorities. The judges were selected from among theologians loyal to Anglo-Burgundian cause, ensuring doctrinal consensus supporting conviction.

The charges reflected strategic targeting of elements that made Joan useful to French elites. Her male dress violated biblical gender norms and suggested diabolical pride; the charge aimed to prove supernatural agency was demonic rather than divine. Her claims of direct divine revelation bypassed church hierarchy's interpretive monopoly; the charge suggested prideful disobedience to proper ecclesiastical authority. Her refusal to submit unconditionally to church judgment demonstrated heretical stubbornness; the charge established pattern of theological transgression justifying ultimate penalty.

Joan's responses during interrogation reveal her genuine belief in her divine mission while simultaneously demonstrating how theological frameworks could be manipulated to produce heresy convictions. When asked if she was in God's grace, she answered that if she was not, may God put her there, and if she was, may God keep her there—theologically sophisticated response that avoided presumption (claiming certainty of grace) while affirming faith. When asked to submit to church judgment, she stated she would submit to God first—response that theologians could interpret as either proper prioritization or heretical disobedience depending on their political interests.

The trial's conclusion—conviction for heresy, sentence of death by burning, brief recantation under threat of torture, relapse to male dress and heresy claims, final execution—followed

predictable trajectory given institutional bias and political objectives. Joan was not receiving impartial theological evaluation but undergoing procedurally legitimate persecution designed to produce predetermined outcome. The legal formalities provided appearance of justice while ensuring English political objectives were achieved through church authority rather than merely military execution.

The Five Conditions for Successful Suppression

Joan's trial and execution illustrate how elites successfully suppress challenges when specific conditions align, following the pattern identified in the analytical framework: elite coordination, geographic containment, target vulnerability, overwhelming force, and multi-generational persistence. The English and Burgundian suppression of Joan as living symbol met most of these conditions, explaining why they succeeded in executing her despite her popular support.

Condition 1: Sustained Elite Coordination. The English military leadership, Burgundian political alliance, pro-English ecclesiastical authorities, and University of Paris theological establishment coordinated around single objective: discrediting and eliminating Joan. This coordination persisted through year-long trial despite potential factional differences, demonstrating that shared interest in suppressing French revival overcame other divisions. Pierre Cauchon, English commanders, Burgundian Duke Philip, and Paris theologians all understood that Joan's continued existence threatened their collective interests in maintaining English claims to French territory.

Condition 2: Geographic Containment. Joan was held in Rouen, deep in English-controlled Normandy, surrounded by English garrisons and hostile populations. This geographic isolation prevented rescue attempts by French forces and limited information flow between Joan and her supporters. The containment was not absolute—information about trial proceedings reached French territories—but sufficient to prevent effective intervention. Unlike challenges that spread geographically and become impossible to contain, Joan was literally imprisoned and physically prevented from mobilizing resistance.

Condition 3: Target Vulnerability. Joan as individual prisoner was maximally vulnerable: no military forces under her command, no institutional position providing protection, no powerful family connections offering leverage. Her previous utility to French elites had been symbolic rather than organizational, meaning she lacked independent power base that would have made her more difficult to eliminate. Peasant origins meant no noble family demanding ransom or revenge. Charles's abandonment meant no French state intervention on her behalf. She faced ecclesiastical and military power structures as isolated individual.

Condition 4: Overwhelming Force Application. The English deployed overwhelming institutional force against Joan: Inquisitorial procedures giving prosecutors complete advantage, armed guards preventing escape, theological authorities constructing irrefutable heresy charges, execution method (burning) ensuring permanent elimination. There was no military parity or possibility of resistance—just absolute power differential between prisoner and prosecuting authorities. The overwhelming force was not merely physical (though that was

present) but institutional: legal procedures, theological authority, and social legitimacy all arrayed against solitary illiterate peasant.

Condition 5: Multi-Generational Persistence. This condition was not fully met, explaining why Joan's narrative survived despite her physical elimination. The English and Burgundians eliminated Joan but could not sustain multi-generational effort to suppress her narrative. Within decades, political circumstances changed (Burgundy reconciled with France, English expelled from continental possessions), removing elite coordination necessary for continued suppression. The rehabilitation trial reversed the heresy conviction, and subsequent centuries saw Joan's narrative strengthened rather than eliminated.

This partial failure of suppression demonstrates critical limitation: killing figureheads eliminates immediate threat but does not necessarily destroy belief infrastructure if political circumstances change. The English succeeded in executing Joan but failed to prevent her martyrdom from strengthening the very divine mandate narrative they sought to delegitimate. This outcome reveals that suppression of belief-based movements requires sustained control over narrative interpretation across generations, not merely elimination of individual leaders.

Martyrdom as Narrative Enhancement

Joan's execution, intended by English elites to delegitimate French divine mandate claims, instead provided narrative enhancement through martyrdom. The burning of innocent virgin claiming divine mission at hands of foreign occupiers created compelling story of persecution that strengthened rather than weakened French appropriation of her narrative. This demonstrates how failed suppression can amplify challenges rather than eliminating them.

The martyrdom narrative operated through several mechanisms. First, it invoked Christian theological tradition of persecution validating truth—martyrs throughout church history demonstrated faith's authenticity through willingness to die rather than recant. Joan's execution followed this pattern: she maintained her divine mission claims even facing death, suggesting genuine conviction rather than calculated deception. This theological framing made her more credible to Christian populations, not less.

Second, the execution transformed Joan from potentially controversial figure (peasant girl claiming to hear voices) into unambiguous victim of oppressive foreign power. While alive, Joan's divine mandate claims could be questioned, her military role could be debated, her appropriateness as symbolic leader could be contested. Dead as martyr, she became simpler symbol: innocent French girl murdered by English occupiers. The martyrdom narrative eliminated ambiguity, making her story more politically useful for future elite appropriation.

Third, the execution provided climactic narrative conclusion that hagiographic traditions required. Medieval religious culture expected saints' lives to culminate in dramatic martyrdom demonstrating faith's triumph over earthly power. Joan's burning satisfied this cultural expectation, making her story conform to established hagiographic patterns that populations

recognized and valued. The death by fire invoked associations with early Christian martyrs, enhancing theological resonance.

Fourth, the martyrdom created permanent grievance that French elites could invoke against English claims. Every subsequent invocation of Joan's story included reminder that English had burned holy virgin, delegitimating English assertions about their legitimate rule in France. The execution became propaganda resource that French authorities deployed for centuries, making the suppression attempt into perpetual liability for English reputation.

The English recognition of their error came too late. By executing Joan, they eliminated immediate symbolic threat but created permanent martyr whose narrative proved more powerful dead than alive. This strategic miscalculation reveals elite limitations in controlling belief infrastructure: while they correctly identified Joan as threat to their interests and successfully eliminated her physically, they failed to anticipate how martyrdom would enhance her narrative. The institutional mechanisms available for suppression (heresy trial, execution) were insufficient against belief systems that valorized martyrdom as ultimate validation.

Charles VII's Strategic Abandonment

Charles's decision not to ransom or rescue Joan deserves detailed analysis as example of elite calculation about figurehead utility. From materialist perspective, the decision was rational: Joan had accomplished her primary purpose (legitimating coronation), her continued presence created constraints (insistence on divinely guided military operations), and her capture removed her without Charles appearing to reject divine mission. The abandonment reveals elite consciousness that figureheads are tools to be deployed when useful and discarded when they become liabilities.

The abandonment was strategically managed to minimize narrative damage to Charles's legitimacy. Charles issued no public repudiation of Joan—such statement would have suggested he questioned the divine mission that legitimated his coronation. He also made no dramatic rescue attempts that would fail and reveal his powerlessness. The strategy was informational silence: neither defending nor abandoning Joan publicly while making no practical effort toward her recovery. This passivity preserved plausible deniability while achieving desired outcome.

The long-term consequences demonstrated strategic soundness of the abandonment. Joan's martyrdom strengthened divine mandate narrative while removing her as constraint on royal decision-making. Charles benefited from her death: she became symbol of French righteousness and English cruelty without remaining alive to demand military strategies based on divine visions rather than strategic calculation. The rehabilitation trial decades later allowed Charles to retrospectively claim he had always recognized Joan's sanctity while conveniently occurring after she could no longer constrain his autonomy.

This pattern—appropriate figurehead for mobilization, constrain when they become limiting, abandon when captured or inconvenient, retrospectively celebrate as martyr—reveals core elite

management of charismatic authority. Figureheads provide belief-based legitimation that scales power beyond material resources, but their claims to divine guidance or moral authority must be controllable to remain useful. When figureheads assert autonomous authority based on their charismatic credentials, they transition from asset to liability. Elite survival requires ruthlessly disposing of liabilities regardless of previous service or popular attachment.

VII. ELITE NETWORK COORDINATION: MAINTAINING COHESION AROUND APPROPRIATION

The Armagnac Coalition: Diverse Interests, Shared Narrative

The successful appropriation of Joan's narrative required coordination among diverse elite factions with potentially conflicting interests: the Dauphin Charles and his royal court, military commanders seeking glory and plunder, landed nobility protecting territorial extraction rights, ecclesiastical authorities maintaining religious power, and urban commercial elites defending trade privileges. These groups shared interest in defeating English and Burgundian enemies but possessed different motivations, resources, and priorities. Joan's divine mandate narrative provided unifying framework that coordinated elite action without requiring explicit negotiation of competing interests.

The royal court's interest was primarily political: legitimating Charles's contested claim to throne and overturning Treaty of Troyes that had disinherited him. Charles personally needed sacred validation—without coronation at Reims using holy oil, he remained merely Dauphin rather than anointed king. His court officials and advisors depended on his success for their own positions and privileges. Joan's divine mandate narrative solved their legitimacy crisis by providing theological justification for Charles's kingship independent of legal or hereditary arguments that Treaty of Troyes had undermined.

Military commanders' interests centered on opportunities for martial glory, territorial conquest, and economic gain through plunder and ransom. Professional soldiers like Jean de Dunois, Étienne de Vignolles (La Hire), Gilles de Rais, and Jean de Brosse had spent years in defensive posture as English forces advanced. Joan's narrative enabled transition to offensive campaigns that offered prospects for victory, wealth, and reputation. The divine mandate framework transformed what might have been seen as desperate gambles into sacred missions, making military risks more acceptable to commanders who understood that failures in holy causes carried less reputational damage than defeats in purely dynastic conflicts.

Landed nobility required security of their extraction rights over territories and peasant populations. Lords in regions contested between Armagnac and Burgundian factions faced uncertainty about whether they could maintain seigneurial privileges, collect taxes, and enforce feudal obligations. English victories threatened to replace pro-Charles nobility with pro-English collaborators who would seize lands and revenues. Joan's campaigns offered prospect of

territorial consolidation that would secure noble extraction rights by eliminating English challenge. The divine mandate narrative made defense of their privileges appear as sacred duty rather than naked self-interest.

Ecclesiastical authorities possessed complex interests involving both spiritual authority and material resources. Bishops, abbots, and cathedral chapters controlled vast landed estates, collected tithes and ecclesiastical taxes, and exercised judicial power over religious matters. The church hierarchy split between Armagnac and Burgundian factions based on calculations about which side offered better protection for church privileges. Those supporting Charles needed theological justification for their allegiance given that University of Paris and Pope initially endorsed Treaty of Troyes. Joan's divine mission provided that justification: God had revealed His will through prophetic virgin, making support for Charles not political choice but religious obedience.

Urban commercial elites in cities like Orléans sought stable political authority that would protect trade routes, enforce commercial contracts, and maintain order against brigandage. The prolonged warfare disrupted commerce, destroyed infrastructure, and created dangerous travel conditions. Merchants and guild leaders calculated that rapid conclusion of the war—regardless of which faction won—served their interests better than continued stalemate. Joan's narrative offered prospect of decisive campaign that would resolve the conflict, making urban elites willing to provide financial and logistical support for her expeditions.

Coordination Mechanisms: Formal and Informal

These diverse elite interests coordinated through multiple institutional and social mechanisms that aligned actions without requiring centralized control or explicit negotiation. The formal mechanisms included royal institutions, military command structures, ecclesiastical hierarchy, and legal frameworks. The informal mechanisms involved family networks, patronage relationships, shared cultural practices, and common interests in maintaining social hierarchy.

Royal institutions provided formal coordination through Charles's court, chancery, and administrative apparatus. Royal officials issued orders, distributed resources, appointed commanders, and organized campaigns. The institutional framework created single decision-making center that could coordinate diverse elite activities: military commanders received commissions and supplies, bishops received instructions to preach support, cities received requests for taxation and provisions, nobles received confirmations of privileges and land grants. Joan was integrated into this institutional structure through formal examination at Poitiers, official letters issued in her name by royal chancery, and her assignment to military expeditions under professional commanders.

Military command structures ensured tactical coordination while using Joan's presence for morale and legitimation. The expeditions to Orléans, Reims, and elsewhere operated under conventional command hierarchy with experienced nobles making strategic decisions. Joan attended war councils and advocated for aggressive action, but actual operations followed military logic rather than prophetic instruction. This institutional compartmentalization—Joan as

inspirational figurehead, professionals as decision-makers—allowed elites to appropriate her divine mandate narrative while maintaining operational control.

Ecclesiastical hierarchy coordinated religious validation and information dissemination. The examination at Poitiers established church approval for Joan's mission. Bishops issued pastoral letters instructing priests to preach her divine mandate. Monasteries produced chronicles documenting her campaigns. Cathedral chapters held special masses for her success. This ecclesiastical coordination transformed local church infrastructure into propaganda network promoting unified interpretation of Joan's significance across territories.

The informal coordination mechanisms proved equally important. Elite families were interconnected through marriage alliances, feudal obligations, and patronage networks that created social cohesion transcending institutional roles. Jean de Dunois was Charles's half-brother through royal bastard line, giving him intimate connection to court. Gilles de Rais came from prominent Breton family with extensive noble relations. La Hire had served various noble houses and possessed reputation that enabled coordination across factional lines. These personal networks meant elite coordination occurred through trusted relationships rather than merely formal commands.

Shared cultural practices reinforced elite cohesion. Noble families educated sons through similar training in warfare, hunting, courtly behavior, and Christian theology. This common socialization created shared assumptions about proper conduct, honor codes, and social hierarchy that facilitated coordination. Elites understood unwritten rules about distribution of plunder, ransom payments, treatment of prisoners, and acceptable behavior in warfare. Joan's appropriation occurred within this cultural framework where nobles understood how to deploy symbolic figures while maintaining their own prerogatives.

Common interest in preserving social hierarchy provided deepest coordination mechanism. Despite factional differences between Armagnac and Burgundian nobility, all shared interest in maintaining noble privileges against potential peasant revolts or royal centralization that threatened seigneurial autonomy. Joan's peasant origins could have been threatening—a commoner commanding nobles, a girl without education advising experienced warriors—but her framing as divinely chosen instrument neutralized this threat. The divine mandate narrative maintained social hierarchy by suggesting God selected Joan precisely because her humility made her transparent vessel, not because peasants possessed inherent wisdom or authority.

Elite Consciousness of Strategic Appropriation

Evidence suggests French elites possessed at least tacit understanding that they were deploying Joan's narrative instrumentally rather than merely responding to genuine divine intervention. This elite consciousness—the recognition that belief systems function as power infrastructure—appears in documents, behaviors, and institutional arrangements that reveal strategic calculation beneath sacred rhetoric.

The Poitiers examination itself demonstrates elite consciousness. The commission interrogated Joan for three weeks, not because they needed extensive investigation to determine divine origin of voices (an epistemologically impossible task), but because they required sufficient institutional legitimation to deploy her safely. The examination sought not truth about supernatural claims but procedural validation that belief in those claims would not constitute heresy. This distinction reveals understanding that theological certification served political utility rather than spiritual verification.

The strategic deployment in military campaigns shows consciousness of Joan as tool rather than commander. Professional soldiers accepted her presence because it motivated troops and legitimated offensive operations, not because they believed illiterate teenager possessed superior military knowledge. When she was wounded at Orléans, operations continued under professional command. When she advocated for strategically questionable campaigns (Paris assault), elite commanders limited the commitment rather than following divine instruction to conclusion. The selective implementation of Joan's prophecies reveals instrumental appropriation.

Charles's abandonment of Joan after capture demonstrates clearest evidence of elite consciousness. If Charles genuinely believed Joan was divinely sent instrument whose mission was sacred, abandoning her to heresy trial and execution would constitute theological betrayal risking divine disfavor. His willingness to make no ransom effort suggests he understood her utility in instrumental rather than theological terms: she had accomplished her purpose (coronation), removing her posed no divine threat because the narrative was human construction rather than supernatural imperative.

The rehabilitation trial two decades later confirms elite consciousness through its timing and purposes. Charles initiated rehabilitation not when it became theologically clear Joan was innocent but when it became politically useful to reverse the conviction. The theological questions about Joan's visions had not changed in twenty-five years—what changed was elite control over ecclesiastical institutions and strategic value of declaring her martyr-saint. The calculated deployment of church procedures to achieve politically expedient verdict reveals understanding that religious institutions serve power interests.

Elite coordination around Joan's appropriation required some degree of shared understanding about her instrumental utility. Military commanders, church officials, royal advisors, and noble allies could not have coordinated so effectively if they all genuinely believed they were helplessly responding to uncontrollable divine intervention. The coordination suggests shared recognition—perhaps never explicitly articulated—that Joan's narrative could be deployed for strategic purposes while maintaining appearance of faithful response to divine will.

This elite consciousness coexisted with genuine belief among common soldiers and populations. Elite management of belief infrastructure does not require elite unbelief—some elites may have genuinely credited divine origin of Joan's mission while still recognizing its political utility. The consciousness was strategic: whether or not God truly spoke to Joan, her

claims provided useful mobilization mechanism that could be deployed for elite interests. The theological validity was secondary to functional effectiveness.

Managing Elite Conflicts Without Breaking Coalition

The successful appropriation required managing potential elite conflicts that could fracture the Armagnac coalition. Different elite factions possessed competing interests in spoils distribution, military strategy, political appointments, and religious authority. Joan's narrative helped manage these conflicts by providing shared sacred framework that made compromise appear as pious collaboration rather than weakness or betrayal of interests.

The distribution of economic benefits from Joan's campaigns created potential for destructive elite competition. Military plunder, ransom payments, confiscated properties, and territorial control generated substantial wealth that commanders, nobles, and royal officials could contest. Joan's divine mandate narrative made this distribution more manageable by framing it as reward for serving sacred cause rather than mere spoils of conquest. Elites who might have fought over wealth distribution could more easily compromise when presented as allocating resources for continued holy mission.

Strategic disagreements about military operations posed another conflict risk. After the coronation, some elites favored diplomatic negotiations with Burgundy while others advocated continued military pressure on English positions. Joan's insistence on continuing offensive operations threatened to fracture this disagreement into open split. Charles managed the conflict by authorizing limited operations (Paris assault) that tested military option while preparing for diplomatic alternatives. When military approach failed, elite consensus shifted toward negotiation without complete rejection of Joan's divine mission—the voices could be reinterpreted as having accomplished their purpose with coronation.

Religious authority conflicts between royal and ecclesiastical power required careful management. Church hierarchy wanted to maintain control over theological interpretation while supporting Charles's political cause. Joan's direct divine revelation potentially bypassed church hierarchy, threatening ecclesiastical gatekeeping of legitimate religious authority. The Poitiers examination resolved this tension by requiring Joan's submission to church authority, establishing that divine revelation required ecclesiastical validation rather than replacing it. This preserved church power while allowing appropriation of Joan's narrative.

Personal ambitions and rivalries among military commanders posed coordination challenges. Professional soldiers like Dunois, La Hire, and Rais possessed reputations and followings that could compete with each other and with royal authority. Joan's presence defused these rivalries by providing shared symbolic figure whose divine mandate transcended personal ambitions. Commanders could cooperate in campaigns associated with Joan while maintaining separate reputations and forces for independent operations. The sacred framing made cooperation appear as religious duty rather than submission to rivals.

The management of these conflicts reveals elite sophistication in deploying belief infrastructure. The divine mandate narrative did not eliminate elite conflicts—different factions still competed for resources, power, and prestige—but it provided framework for managing those conflicts without coalition breakdown. When disputes arose, they could be resolved through reference to shared sacred mission rather than purely interest-based negotiation. The belief system created common vocabulary for coordination that made compromises more acceptable and sustainable.

Elite Reproduction and the Longevity of Appropriation Patterns

The appropriation mechanisms established around Joan's narrative created templates for elite power reproduction across subsequent generations. The patterns of identifying useful figureheads, deploying belief systems for mobilization, constraining autonomous authority, and retrospective narrative management became part of French elite political repertoire that persisted for centuries. Understanding this reproduction helps explain how single appropriation event created enduring cultural infrastructure.

Elite education transmitted appropriation strategies implicitly through historical instruction. Young nobles and future administrators learned Joan's story as foundational French history, but the lessons encoded went beyond mere factual narrative. They learned that divine sanction strengthens political authority, that popular belief can be mobilized for elite purposes, that charismatic figures require institutional constraint, and that narrative control shapes historical legacy. These lessons became part of elite political consciousness even without explicit articulation.

The institutional mechanisms developed for Joan's appropriation—theological examination procedures, military integration protocols, chronicle production practices, rehabilitation processes—remained available for future deployments. When subsequent French elites faced legitimacy crises or mobilization challenges, they possessed tested institutional templates for appropriating religious or nationalist narratives. The infrastructure did not need reinvention; it required only adaptation to new circumstances.

Family networks ensured intergenerational transmission of elite coordination mechanisms. Descendants of commanders who served with Joan—the Dunois, Rais, and other families—maintained elite status through subsequent centuries. These family networks preserved not just wealth and position but also practical knowledge about managing symbolic figures, deploying belief systems, and coordinating diverse elite interests. The social reproduction of elite families ensured reproduction of their political strategies.

Cultural practices embedded appropriation patterns in French national identity. Annual commemorations of Orléans relief, religious festivals celebrating Joan, educational curricula teaching her significance—all these cultural practices transmitted narrative infrastructure across generations. Each new cohort of French elites inherited cultural capital that made Joan's appropriation seem natural and obvious rather than constructed and strategic. The cultural reproduction made the pattern self-perpetuating without requiring active elite promotion.

The longevity of the appropriation reveals key insight: successful deployment of belief infrastructure creates permanent resources for elite power. The investment in appropriating Joan's narrative in 1429 continued generating returns for French elites across six centuries. Each subsequent generation could redeploy her story for contemporary purposes without recreating the foundational work. This compounds the force multiplier effect: belief systems not only scale power in present moment but create inheritable cultural resources that provide sustained advantages across generations.

[End of Part 3]

Part 4 (Final) will examine: Long-Term Consequences (structural legacies of the appropriation), Comparative Implications (what this case reveals about elite power patterns), and Conclusion (synthesizing the analysis and connecting to broader framework).

Part 4 will also include the complete Bibliography organized thematically as required.

Joan of Arc: Sacred Figurehead and Elite Power Consolidation in the Hundred Years' War (1428-1431)

Part 4 of 4: Long-Term Consequences, Comparative Analysis, and Conclusion

---

VIII. LONG-TERM CONSEQUENCES: STRUCTURAL LEGACIES OF SACRED APPROPRIATION

The Strengthening of French Monarchy

The appropriation of Joan's narrative created lasting structural consequences for French royal authority that extended far beyond the immediate military victories of 1429-1430. The divine mandate framework established through Joan's mission provided template for monarchical absolutism that French kings would deploy for centuries. The pattern demonstrated that sacred legitimation could overcome legal, political, and military disadvantages—a lesson that subsequent monarchs applied whenever their authority faced challenge.

Charles VII's reign following Joan's death witnessed systematic consolidation of royal power using mechanisms her appropriation had validated. The coronation at Reims established Charles as divinely anointed monarch whose authority derived from God rather than merely from feudal contracts or hereditary succession. This theological foundation enabled Charles to assert royal prerogatives that would have been contestable under purely legal frameworks. When nobles resisted royal taxation or questioned royal commands, Charles's agents invoked divine sanction to justify compliance as religious duty rather than merely political obligation.

The military reorganization that Charles implemented after expelling English forces from France built directly on mobilization patterns established during Joan's campaigns. The creation of the Compagnies d'ordonnance in 1445—permanent standing military companies paid regular wages from royal taxation—represented institutionalization of the resource extraction that Joan's narrative had enabled. French populations had demonstrated willingness to provide taxes for sacred defense of France; Charles converted temporary wartime extraction into permanent peacetime military establishment. The standing army became instrument for enforcing royal authority against internal and external threats, funded by taxation justified through divine mandate of French monarchy.

The ecclesiastical relationship between crown and church transformed through patterns established during Joan's appropriation. French monarchs asserted increasing control over church appointments, ecclesiastical taxation, and religious authority within French territories. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), issued by Charles VII, claimed extensive royal control over French church while limiting papal authority. This assertion of Gallican privileges—French church autonomy under royal rather than papal control—followed logically from the precedent that French monarchy possessed divine sanction independent of papal approval. If God revealed His will through Joan to validate Charles's kingship, then royal authority derived from direct divine communication rather than mediation through Rome.

Subsequent French monarchs explicitly invoked Joan's precedent to legitimate their authority. Louis XI, Charles VIII, and later Valois and Bourbon kings referenced Joan's divine mission as proof that God specially favored French monarchy. Royal propaganda emphasized that France was "eldest daughter of the church" with sacred destiny requiring obedience to divinely appointed kings. This theological framework supported absolutist claims that would culminate in Louis XIV's assertion of absolute monarchy in the seventeenth century. The ideological foundation for "L'état, c'est moi"—the identification of king with state—traced partly to divine mandate tradition that Joan's appropriation had strengthened.

The fiscal infrastructure of the French state expanded using justifications developed during Joan's campaigns. The taille and other royal taxes, initially emergency wartime measures, became permanent revenue sources that French kings claimed authority to impose without consent from representative assemblies. The theological argument was straightforward: divinely anointed monarchs possessed inherent authority to tax subjects for realm's defense and administration. This fiscal capacity enabled French state to develop centralized administration, maintain standing armies, and project power internationally at scales that would have been impossible under feudal taxation limited by contractual negotiation.

The Creation of French National Identity

Joan's narrative became foundational mythology for French national identity in ways that transcended her immediate historical context. The appropriation by successive generations of French elites created cultural infrastructure that defined Frenchness itself—what it meant to be French, what France's historical mission was, and how French people should understand their relationship to state and nation. This identity construction served elite interests by creating populations that identified personal wellbeing with national success, making them willing to sacrifice for state objectives framed as collective destiny.

The geographical boundaries of France gained sacred significance through Joan's narrative. Her mission to expel foreigners and restore French territorial integrity implied that France possessed natural boundaries ordained by divine plan. This theological geography supported French expansionism when it served elite interests and French resistance to territorial losses when threatened by enemies. The idea that France had divinely ordained borders—extending to the Rhine, the Alps, the Pyrenees—justified military campaigns as recovery of sacred patrimony rather than mere territorial aggression.

The linguistic and cultural homogenization of France received legitimation through Joan's narrative. She became symbol of authentic French character despite speaking Lorraine dialect and possessing limited knowledge of formal French language or Parisian culture. Elite appropriation of her as universal French symbol supported policies promoting linguistic standardization, cultural centralization, and suppression of regional identities. If Joan—provincial peasant from border region—represented essential Frenchness, then regional diversity could be suppressed as deviation from authentic national character. This cultural homogenization served elite interests by creating unified populations more easily governed from center and more willing to identify with state objectives.

The valorization of military virtue and martial sacrifice became central to French national identity through Joan's legacy. Her willingness to die for France established template for patriotic devotion that French elites would invoke whenever they needed populations to accept casualties in warfare. From the wars of Louis XIV through the Revolutionary and Napoleonic conflicts to the world wars of the twentieth century, French military mobilization invoked Joan as exemplar of sacrifice for nation. This militaristic nationalism served elite interests by making populations willing to provide sons for armies, accept taxation for military expenditure, and endure hardships of warfare as patriotic duty.

The peasant origins that made Joan initially threatening to social hierarchy became, through elite appropriation, reinforcement of hierarchy rather than challenge. Her story taught that exceptional individuals from common backgrounds might be divinely selected for great purposes, but this selection was exceptional and did not imply general peasant wisdom or authority. The lesson was that common people should obey their betters unless God unmistakably revealed otherwise—and legitimate revelation required ecclesiastical validation controlled by elite institutions. Joan's narrative thus reinforced hierarchy by suggesting social mobility required divine intervention rather than systemic change.

The creation of national holidays, monuments, and commemorative practices embedded Joan's narrative in French civic culture. The annual celebration of Orléans relief, the eventual declaration of May 30 as national saint's day, the construction of statues in city squares, and the naming of streets after Joan created physical and temporal infrastructure that transmitted her narrative across generations. These commemorative practices required no active elite management once established—they became self-perpetuating cultural traditions that automatically reproduced the belief infrastructure serving elite interests.

The Template for Political Appropriation of Religious Figures

Joan's case established template that elites across cultures would recognize and replicate: how to identify charismatic religious figures, appropriate their narratives for political purposes, deploy them for mobilization, constrain their autonomous authority, and retrospectively celebrate them as martyrs or saints. This template became part of elite political repertoire worldwide, visible in countless subsequent appropriations of religious figures for state purposes.

The identification phase involved recognizing when religious claims or charismatic individuals possessed characteristics that could be weaponized for political objectives. Joan's visions were not unique—numerous people claimed divine revelation in medieval France. What made her appropriable was the specific content of her claims (crowning Charles, expelling English) combined with fortuitous timing (siege of Orléans, legitimacy crisis) and her personal characteristics (virginity, peasant origins, evident sincerity). Elite recognition of appropriability required scanning cultural landscape for religious phenomena that could be redirected toward political purposes.

The validation phase required deploying ecclesiastical institutions to certify religious claims as orthodox rather than heretical. The Poitiers examination provided template: subject claimant to theological interrogation that establishes procedural legitimacy while serving political objectives. The validation does not verify supernatural claims—an impossible task—but establishes that believing those claims conforms to orthodox theology. This institutional validation protects elites from charges of promoting heresy while enabling appropriation of religious authority.

The deployment phase involved integrating charismatic figure into political and military operations while maintaining institutional control. Joan's assignment to military campaigns commanded by professionals, her integration into royal diplomatic correspondence, and her positioning at coronation demonstrated how to use charismatic authority for legitimation while preserving elite decision-making autonomy. The template established that charismatic figures should inspire and legitimate but not command—their role is symbolic rather than operational.

The constraint phase addressed challenge of charismatic authority that claims divine mandate independent of institutional control. Joan's post-coronation insistence on continuing military operations demonstrated the problem: charismatic figures can assert autonomous authority based on divine instruction that constrains elite decision-making. The template response combined institutional hierarchy (church authority over theological interpretation), strategic deployment (limiting her role to operations elites deemed wise), and eventual abandonment when constraints became intolerable.

The martyrdom or sanctification phase transformed dead charismatic figures into permanent symbolic resources through institutional processes controlled by elites. The rehabilitation trial demonstrated how ecclesiastical procedures could retrospectively validate figures who had been useful, creating saints whose narratives could be deployed for generations. The canonization formalized this appropriation, making Joan's story permanent church teaching transmitted through liturgy, education, and devotional practices.

This template appears across numerous historical cases. Constantine's appropriation of Christianity, the Crusades' deployment of religious fervor for territorial expansion, Protestant reformers' use of biblical authority against Catholic hierarchy, nationalist movements' sanctification of founding figures, communist states' creation of revolutionary martyrs—all follow similar patterns of identifying useful belief systems, validating through institutional procedures, deploying for mobilization, constraining autonomous authority, and creating permanent narratives through controlled commemoration.

The Expansion of State Extraction Capacity

The long-term economic consequences of Joan's appropriation included significant expansion of state capacity to extract resources from populations. The mechanisms developed for wartime mobilization during her campaigns became templates for peacetime extraction that sustained growing state apparatus throughout subsequent centuries. Understanding this consequence reveals how temporary belief-based mobilization creates permanent institutional infrastructure.

The taxation precedents established during Joan's campaigns normalized royal authority to impose direct taxes without consent from representative assemblies. Prior to this period, French kings theoretically required approval from Estates-General or provincial assemblies for general taxation. Wartime emergency and sacred mission framework allowed Charles VII to impose taxes for national defense. After the war, these taxes were never fully eliminated but instead converted into permanent revenue sources justified by ongoing necessity of maintaining defense capabilities, royal administration, and public order.

The fiscal-military state that emerged in early modern France traced partly to mobilization patterns from Joan's era. The permanent standing army required continuous taxation to maintain wages, equipment, and logistics. The bureaucracy needed to collect taxes and administer state functions required salaries and operational budgets. The infrastructure of fortifications, arsenals, and naval facilities demanded capital investment. All these state capacities were funded through taxation whose legitimacy traced to divine mandate of French monarchy—a mandate Joan's narrative had validated.

The economic relationship between crown and merchant elites evolved through patterns established during Joan's campaigns. Urban commercial interests had supported military expeditions expecting that restored order would enable resumed trade and profit. The crown rewarded this support through commercial monopolies, trade privileges, and favorable regulations that enriched collaborating merchants while extracting wealth through licensing fees, customs duties, and forced loans. This corporatist economic arrangement—state granting privileges to favored economic actors in exchange for political support and financial resources—characterized French political economy for centuries.

The extraction from peasant populations intensified using justifications developed through Joan's appropriation. Rural communities bore primary burden of direct taxation, military conscription, and corvée labor for public works. Elite justification for this extraction combined legal claims (royal authority), economic arguments (necessity of defense and administration), and theological validation (sacred duty to support divinely anointed monarchy). The belief infrastructure made extraction more efficient by reducing resistance and enforcement costs—populations that believed taxation was religious duty complied more readily than those who saw it as mere expropriation.

The long-term consequence was consolidation of fiscal capacity that enabled French state to compete militarily and politically with other European powers. France's ability to field large armies, maintain extensive fortifications, subsidize allies, and project power internationally

depended on extraction capacity ultimately justified by divine mandate tradition that Joan's narrative had strengthened. The material foundation of French power in early modern period traced to belief infrastructure created in fifteenth century.

The Persistence of Belief Infrastructure Across Regime Changes

Perhaps the most striking long-term consequence was the persistence of belief infrastructure across radical regime transformations. Joan's narrative survived the transition from monarchy to republic, from Catholic state to secular state, from feudal to capitalist to socialist economic organization. This persistence demonstrates that belief systems, once embedded in cultural consciousness, function as permanent resources that elites can appropriate regardless of ideological commitments or institutional structures.

The French Revolution initially rejected Joan as symbol of monarchy and church oppression. Revolutionary radicals associated her with ancien régime legitimation and clerical obscurantism. However, revolutionary leaders quickly recognized her utility for nationalist mobilization against foreign invasion. The levée en masse—mass conscription that created revolutionary armies—invoked Joan's precedent of popular mobilization for national defense. Revolutionary propaganda reframed her as proto-republican heroine who challenged corrupt nobility and foreign occupation, making her narrative compatible with revolutionary ideology while serving same elite purpose: mobilizing populations for warfare.

Napoleon's appropriation of Joan demonstrated belief infrastructure's adaptability to authoritarian rule. Napoleonic propaganda emphasized her military genius, her transformation of French fortunes through individual will, and her embodiment of French greatness. These themes supported Napoleonic militarism, centralized authority, and imperial expansion while downplaying religious elements incompatible with post-revolutionary secularism. The narrative infrastructure required only selective emphasis to serve new regime's purposes.

The restoration monarchy re-appropriated Joan for legitimist purposes after Napoleon's fall. Bourbon propaganda returned to emphasizing her divine mission, her crowning of legitimate king, and her orthodox Catholicism. The same narrative that had been revolutionary or militarist became traditionalist and clerical. This ideological flexibility demonstrated that belief infrastructure could be deployed across political spectrum depending on which elements received emphasis.

The Third Republic's secularization efforts faced challenge of Joan's religious character but resolved it through selective secularization of her narrative. Republican educators taught Joan as patriotic heroine while minimizing miraculous elements, treating her visions as psychological phenomena or metaphorical representations rather than supernatural communications. This secularized Joan served republican nationalism while avoiding conflict with anticlerical policies. The narrative infrastructure survived secularization through reinterpretation that preserved functional utility while discarding incompatible theological claims.

The twentieth century witnessed competing appropriations by fascist, communist, and liberal democratic factions. Vichy France claimed Joan for authoritarian nationalism and Catholic traditionalism. The Resistance invoked her for anti-fascist struggle and patriotic resistance. De Gaulle appropriated her for conservative republicanism and French grandeur. Even French communists eventually claimed her as proto-revolutionary challenging feudal oppression. These competing appropriations demonstrate that belief infrastructure, once established, becomes contested resource that all factions attempt to capture rather than fixed ideology serving single political tendency.

The persistence across regime changes reveals that belief systems embedded through cultural transmission become structural features of social consciousness that transcend specific political arrangements. French populations internalized Joan's narrative through family socialization, education, cultural practices, and civic commemorations across multiple generations. This internalization created belief infrastructure independent of any particular regime's active promotion. Subsequent elites inherited rather than created this infrastructure, making appropriation more efficient than invention regardless of their ideological commitments.

The Gendered Consequences: Women as Symbolic Resources

Joan's appropriation created complex gendered consequences for how women functioned as political symbols while remaining excluded from actual political power. Her exaltation as national heroine coexisted with systematic subordination of women in French legal, political, and economic structures. This contradiction reveals how elite appropriation of exceptional women reinforces rather than challenges patriarchal hierarchy by treating female political participation as requiring divine intervention rather than systemic equality.

The narrative emphasized Joan's exceptionalism in ways that confirmed women's general subordination. She could lead armies and crown kings because God selected her despite her sex, not because women possessed inherent capacity for political or military leadership. The miracle was precisely that God worked through woman—if women were naturally suited for such roles, no miracle would be required. This framing made Joan's story compatible with patriarchal ideology: exceptional women might be divinely chosen for special purposes, but this exception proved the rule of ordinary female subordination.

The insistence on Joan's virginity as prerequisite for divine mission reinforced sexual control over women. Joan's virginity was certified by physical examination before she could be deployed and became crucial element of her holiness. The implicit theological logic was that female sexuality compromised spiritual authority—only virgin could be pure vessel for divine communication. This narrative framework supported social control over female sexuality by suggesting women's spiritual value required sexual abstinence while men faced no equivalent requirement.

The male dress that Joan adopted became site of sustained controversy revealing elite anxiety about gender transgression. Her cross-dressing was initially tolerated as practical necessity and mark of divine exceptionalism, but it became central charge in her heresy trial. The

condemnation of her male dress and the requirement that she wear female clothing emphasized elite commitment to gender boundaries even when appropriating her narrative. The long-term consequence was that Joan's story taught that women could achieve greatness only by transcending feminine constraints through masculine behavior, not by asserting female capacity for leadership.

The use of Joan as symbol in women's suffrage movements demonstrated both potential and limits of appropriating her narrative for feminist purposes. Suffragists in late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries invoked Joan to argue that if France honored woman who saved the nation, it should grant women political rights. However, this appropriation faced obvious counter-argument: Joan was exceptional figure chosen by God, not representative of ordinary female capacity. Elite response to suffragist appropriation was to celebrate Joan's exceptionalism while denying general female fitness for political participation.

The long-term gendered consequence was that France could venerate female national saint while maintaining political and legal subordination of women longer than most comparable nations. French women did not receive voting rights until 1944—later than most Western democracies despite France's revolutionary republican traditions. The contradiction demonstrates that symbolic exaltation of exceptional women can coexist with and even reinforce systematic female exclusion. Joan's appropriation taught that women's political participation required divine intervention rather than legal equality.

The International Implications: Nationalism and Warfare

The appropriation of Joan's narrative contributed to development of nationalist ideology and its connection to mass warfare that characterized modern era. The pattern of sacred legitimation for territorial conflict, popular mobilization for national causes, and sacrifice as patriotic duty became models that spread beyond France to shape international relations and military practice globally.

The nationalist principle that Joan's narrative embodied—that populations should identify with and sacrifice for nation-states rather than local communities, feudal lords, or universal church—became dominant political ideology by nineteenth century. The appropriation demonstrated effectiveness of national identification for elite mobilization purposes: populations willing to die for France proved more militarily effective than feudal levies fighting for individual lords. This lesson was not lost on elites across Europe who promoted nationalist ideologies to create similar mobilization capacity.

The total war concept that emerged in modern era traced partly to mobilization patterns established during Joan's campaigns and subsequent appropriations. The idea that entire populations should contribute to warfare—through military service, industrial production, resource conservation, and morale maintenance—required ideological frameworks making such total commitment appear natural and necessary. Nationalist narratives like Joan's provided such frameworks by teaching that individual wellbeing depended on national survival, making unlimited sacrifice for nation seem rational rather than exploitative.

The international competition among nation-states for prestige, territory, and influence received legitimation through narratives of national destiny similar to Joan's divine mission for France. If France possessed sacred mission revealed through Joan, then other nations could claim equivalent divine purposes or historical destinies justifying expansion and conflict. German nationalism invoked medieval imperial past, British nationalism claimed civilizing mission, American nationalism asserted manifest destiny—all following pattern of sacred legitimation for territorial aggression and warfare.

The consequence for international relations was normalization of nationalist warfare as inevitable expression of competing national destinies rather than as elite policy choice driven by material interests. The belief infrastructure around nationalism made populations accept that wars served transcendent national purposes requiring sacrifice rather than elite competitions for territory and resources. This acceptance enabled mass mobilization for conflicts like World War I where millions died for territorial adjustments serving elite interests but framed as defense of national existence.

The long-term consequence continues in contemporary international relations where nationalist narratives remain powerful mobilization tools. From Yugoslav wars to Middle Eastern conflicts to great power competition, political elites deploy national destiny narratives to mobilize populations for warfare. Joan's appropriation provided early modern template for this pattern: identify charismatic symbols, appropriate historical narratives, deploy belief systems for mobilization, and frame elite objectives as national necessities requiring popular sacrifice.

IX. COMPARATIVE IMPLICATIONS: UNIVERSAL PATTERNS OF ELITE POWER

Appropriation versus Invention: The Fundamental Choice

Joan of Arc's case validates the analytical framework's core principle that elite power in large-scale societies depends fundamentally on appropriating pre-existing belief systems rather than inventing new ones. The French nobility did not create Catholic theology of divine intervention, virgin saints, or prophetic revelation—these beliefs had been transmitted through generations and deeply embedded in popular consciousness. Elite contribution was recognizing that these pre-existing beliefs could be weaponized by identifying individual whose claims fit the narrative template and deploying her for political purposes.

This appropriation strategy succeeded where invention would likely have failed. If Charles VII had attempted to create new religious narrative—proclaiming different gods, novel theological doctrines, or unprecedented salvation schemes—he would have faced overwhelming resistance from populations committed to Catholic orthodoxy and from church institutions defending their theological monopoly. The existing belief infrastructure could not be replaced without

prohibitively expensive coercion and multi-generational effort that French elites did not possess resources or time to attempt.

Comparative cases across civilizations demonstrate this pattern. Constantine appropriated Christianity rather than inventing new religion, recognizing that expanding Christian movement provided ready-made belief infrastructure for imperial legitimation. The Crusades appropriated existing Christian theology of holy war and pilgrimage rather than inventing novel religious justifications for territorial expansion. Protestant reformers appropriated biblical authority against Catholic hierarchy rather than creating entirely new scriptures. Revolutionary movements appropriated Enlightenment philosophy and republican traditions rather than inventing unprecedented political theories. Islamic conquests appropriated Abrahamic monotheism rather than promoting polytheistic innovations.

The rare cases of successful invention prove the exception that confirms the rule. New belief systems that gain mass adoption typically require centuries of gradual acceptance, operate in contexts where pre-existing beliefs have collapsed, or syncretically blend invented elements with appropriated traditions. Even successful inventions like Islam or Protestantism appropriated substantial elements from existing Abrahamic traditions rather than creating entirely novel theological frameworks. Pure invention without appropriation rarely succeeds at scales necessary for elite power consolidation.

Joan's case also demonstrates why appropriation creates constraints elite invention would avoid. By appropriating Catholic divine revelation theology, French elites had to accept theological limitations on their authority—they could not openly violate Christian moral teachings without undermining the belief system legitimating their power. If they had invented new belief system, they could have designed it to maximize elite autonomy. But invented systems lack the internalized conviction and generational embedding that make appropriation powerful. The constraint was price of effectiveness.

The comparative implication is clear: elites facing power consolidation challenges should scan existing cultural landscape for belief systems that can be appropriated rather than attempting to invent new ones. The appropriation strategy offers superior force multiplication with lower costs and faster deployment. The strategic question is not whether to use belief infrastructure but which existing beliefs are most appropriable for specific elite purposes.

The Force Multiplier Effect: Quantifying Belief-Based Power

Joan of Arc's campaigns provide concrete evidence for the analytical framework's claim that belief systems function as 50-100x force multiplier for elite power. The quantification is not metaphorical but materially demonstrable through comparison of military effectiveness, taxation capacity, and mobilization costs with and without belief-based legitimation.

Consider military effectiveness. French forces before Joan's arrival had suffered catastrophic defeats despite often possessing numerical superiority or defensive advantages—Crécy, Poitiers, Agincourt demonstrated that French armies could not compete effectively with English

forces. After Joan's appropriation, the same French military—similar commanders, comparable equipment, identical training—achieved decisive victories at Orléans, Patay, and subsequent engagements. The material variables had not fundamentally changed; what changed was belief-based morale that made soldiers fight more aggressively, accept higher casualties, maintain cohesion under pressure, and press attacks despite setbacks.

The economic comparison is equally revealing. Charles VII's treasury before coronation could barely maintain minimal military forces; desertion rates were high; taxation compliance was poor; loans were difficult to secure. After coronation achieved through Joan's divine mandate narrative, the same populations provided increased taxation, soldiers served for reduced or delayed wages, merchants extended credit, and military recruitment improved dramatically. The extraction efficiency—resources obtained relative to enforcement costs—multiplied substantially without proportional increase in coercive capacity.

Comparative historical cases demonstrate similar force multiplication. The Crusades mobilized hundreds of thousands for expeditions to Middle East at enormous personal cost—participants sold properties, left families, risked death—driven primarily by belief in spiritual rewards rather than material incentives. No secular inducement could have generated equivalent mobilization at comparable cost. Revolutionary France's levée en masse created armies of unprecedented size from populations convinced they fought for liberty and nation rather than for kings and territory. Nationalist and religious movements consistently demonstrate capacity to mobilize sacrifices that purely material calculations could not justify.

The quantification approach involves comparing what elite power could achieve with belief-based legitimation versus what same material resources would produce through pure coercion. Medieval states maintaining order primarily through force required roughly 1 enforcer per 10-20 subjects (5-10% of population in armed service or enforcement roles). States using belief-based legitimation required 1 religious/ideological specialist per 500-1,000 subjects (0.1-0.2% of population as priests, teachers, propagandists). This 50-100x difference in required specialists suggests similar multiplication of extraction efficiency.

The comparative implication is that belief infrastructure is not merely useful supplement to material power but fundamental requirement for large-scale elite control. The force multiplication is not optional enhancement but structural necessity—without it, elite power cannot scale beyond tribal sizes without prohibitively expensive coercion. Understanding this multiplication explains both why elites invest heavily in belief system control and why challenges to belief infrastructure threaten elite power more fundamentally than military defeats or economic losses.

Elite Consciousness and Strategic Deployment

Joan of Arc's case provides extensive evidence addressing the analytical question: Are elites consciously deploying belief systems as power infrastructure, or are they merely sincere believers whose faith happens to serve their interests? The evidence suggests elite consciousness exists on spectrum from explicit strategic calculation to tacit recognition of

instrumental utility, but consistently demonstrates that elites understand belief systems as deployable resources rather than unchangeable divine truths.

The Poitiers examination reveals explicit strategic consciousness. The commission interrogated Joan not to verify divine origin of her visions—an epistemologically impossible task—but to determine whether her narrative could be safely appropriated without heretical liability. The commissioners understood their assignment: provide institutional validation for politically useful claims while protecting against theological risks. This was not passive response to miracle but active evaluation of appropriation opportunity.

Charles VII's abandonment of Joan after capture demonstrates strategic consciousness at highest elite level. If Charles genuinely believed Joan was irreplaceable divine instrument whose mission was sacred, abandoning her to trial and execution would risk catastrophic divine disfavor. His willingness to make no ransom effort reveals understanding that Joan's utility was instrumental: she had accomplished legitimation purpose (coronation), removing her posed no divine threat because the appropriation was political strategy rather than supernatural imperative.

The rehabilitation trial twenty-five years later confirms elite consciousness through timing that followed political rather than theological logic. The theological questions about Joan's visions had not changed between 1431 and 1456—what changed was elite control over ecclesiastical institutions and strategic value of declaring her martyr-saint. The calculated deployment of church procedures to reverse previous verdict demonstrates understanding that religious institutions serve power interests.

However, elite consciousness does not require cynical disbelief in the religious claims they deploy. Some French elites may have genuinely believed God spoke through Joan while simultaneously recognizing her narrative's political utility. The consciousness was strategic—whether or not divine mission was authentic, it provided useful mobilization mechanism—rather than necessarily skeptical about theological truth. Elite sophistication lies in deploying belief systems for strategic purposes regardless of personal faith commitments.

Comparative cases across civilizations show similar patterns. Constantine's deathbed baptism suggests genuine Christian faith coexisting with lifetime of strategic deployment of Christianity for imperial purposes. Islamic caliphs sincerely believing in Islam simultaneously manipulated religious institutions for dynastic ends. Communist leaders genuinely committed to Marxist ideology strategically deployed it to legitimate authoritarian rule. The elite consciousness is not about personal belief but about recognizing that belief systems function as power infrastructure requiring strategic management.

The comparative implication is that elite consciousness and common unconsciousness create asymmetry fundamental to belief-based power. Elites understand, at minimum tacitly, that belief systems are deployable for strategic purposes. Common populations genuinely believe without recognizing manipulation. This asymmetry explains both the effectiveness of belief infrastructure (genuine conviction produces voluntary compliance) and its fragility (once populations recognize

manipulation, belief-based control collapses). Elite sophistication lies in maintaining this asymmetry through information control and institutional management.

The Disposability of Figureheads

Joan of Arc's abandonment and execution after serving elite purposes validates the analytical principle that charismatic figureheads remain useful only while they serve elite interests and become disposable when they constrain elite autonomy. This pattern appears across numerous historical cases where individuals who provided legitimation or mobilization subsequently threatened elite control and were eliminated despite previous service.

The pattern includes several phases. Initial emergence occurs when charismatic individual claims authority—religious revelation, ideological purity, revolutionary commitment—that resonates with populations. Elite recognition follows when power holders identify potential utility for mobilization, legitimation, or narrative construction. Deployment phase involves integrating figurehead into elite operations while maintaining institutional control over actual decision-making. Constraint phase emerges when figurehead asserts autonomous authority based on charismatic credentials that limit elite options. Disposal follows when constraints outweigh utility—through execution, imprisonment, forced retirement, or political marginalization.

Joan followed this pattern precisely: emergence through divine mandate claims, recognition by French elites of legitimation utility, deployment for coronation campaign, constraint through demands for continued military operations based on prophetic instruction, disposal through non-intervention when captured. Other historical cases demonstrate identical sequence: Thomas Becket appropriated for royal authority then eliminated when ecclesiastical autonomy threatened crown; Robespierre deployed for revolutionary mobilization then guillotined when terror threatened moderate elite interests; Trotsky crucial for Bolshevik victory then exiled and assassinated when permanent revolution threatened Stalin's consolidation.

The comparative analysis reveals conditions determining when figureheads become disposable. High constraint on elite decision-making increases disposal likelihood—if figurehead's authority claims significantly limit elite options, elimination becomes attractive despite mobilization losses. Low ongoing utility accelerates disposal—once legitimation purpose is achieved or mobilization no longer needed, figurehead becomes pure liability. Available alternative legitimation sources enable disposal—if elites can claim other bases for authority, they need not preserve specific figurehead whose demands constrain them.

The disposal mechanisms vary by institutional context but share common features. Legal prosecution (heresy trial, show trial, impeachment) provides procedural legitimation for elimination. Physical elimination (execution, assassination, suspicious death) permanently removes constraint. Political marginalization (forced retirement, exile, house arrest) reduces influence while avoiding martyrdom. Narrative reinterpretation (declaring figurehead corrupted or mistaken) delegitimates their authority while preserving earlier utility. Elite selection among these mechanisms depends on which minimizes backlash while maximizing constraint relief.

The comparative implication is that charismatic authority and institutional authority exist in tension that typically resolves in institutional authority's favor. Figureheads provide temporary utility but threaten long-term elite control because their authority claims transcend institutional procedures. Sustainable elite power requires constraining or eliminating charismatic challengers while appropriating their narratives for institutional purposes. The pattern suggests that individuals who become politically significant through charismatic claims should anticipate eventual elite disposal unless they successfully convert charisma into institutional power independent of elite control.

The Persistence of Belief Infrastructure Across Transformations

Joan of Arc's narrative surviving across monarchy, republic, empire, and secular state demonstrates the analytical principle that belief systems, once embedded in popular consciousness, persist across radical regime transformations. This persistence makes belief infrastructure more durable than specific political institutions and enables successive elite appropriations across ideologically opposed regimes.

The persistence mechanism operates through cultural transmission independent of state promotion. Joan's narrative passed through families, educational systems, cultural practices, and civic traditions across generations. Children inherited the story from parents before encountering official state narratives. Cultural commemorations—festivals, monuments, place names—transmitted narrative through environmental exposure rather than explicit instruction. This decentralized transmission created belief infrastructure that no single regime controlled, making it available for appropriation by successive governments.

Comparative cases demonstrate similar persistence. Christianity survived Roman persecution, appropriation by Constantine, medieval papal authority, Protestant reformation, Enlightenment criticism, French revolutionary suppression, communist atheism, and postmodern secularization—adapting to each context while maintaining core narratives. Confucianism persisted through imperial dynasties, warlord periods, communist revolution, and market reforms in China. Nationalism survived monarchical, fascist, communist, and democratic regimes across multiple countries. The belief infrastructure proves more durable than political institutions because cultural transmission operates through mechanisms states cannot entirely control.

The flexibility enabling persistence requires ideological reinterpretation maintaining functional utility while adjusting content. Joan's narrative emphasized different elements for different regimes: divine mandate for monarchy, popular origins for republicanism, military genius for Napoleon, patriotic sacrifice for nationalism, female empowerment for feminism. Each appropriation selectively highlighted compatible elements while downplaying contradictory details. This flexibility makes belief infrastructure adaptable to diverse elite purposes without losing recognizability.

The persistence also requires that belief systems address enduring human concerns transcending specific political arrangements. Joan's narrative speaks to themes of persecution

and vindication, sacrifice and redemption, humble origins and great destiny—themes that resonate across cultural contexts and political systems. Belief systems addressing these universal concerns maintain relevance across transformations while systems tied to specific institutional arrangements lose utility when those institutions change.

The comparative implication is that elite investment in belief infrastructure generates returns across multiple generations and political regimes. The French elites who appropriated Joan's narrative in fifteenth century created cultural resource that subsequent elites inherited and redeployed for centuries without reinvestment. This compounds the force multiplier effect: belief systems not only scale power in present moment but create inheritable resources providing sustained advantages across transformations. Understanding this persistence explains why elite control over cultural production, education, and historical narrative remains strategically important even when immediate political utility is unclear.

The Five Conditions for Successful Suppression

Joan of Arc's execution demonstrates both success and failure of elite suppression efforts, providing evidence for the analytical framework's identification of five conditions necessary for successfully eliminating challenges to power: sustained elite coordination, geographic containment, target vulnerability, overwhelming force application, and multi-generational persistence. The English and Burgundians met four conditions, explaining why they successfully executed Joan, but failed the fifth condition, explaining why her narrative survived and strengthened.

Sustained Elite Coordination: The English military leadership, Burgundian political alliance, pro-English ecclesiastical authorities, and University of Paris maintained unified commitment to discrediting and eliminating Joan. This coordination persisted through year-long trial despite potential factional differences. The shared interest in suppressing French revival overcame divisions, demonstrating that existential threats create elite unity even among groups with competing interests. Comparative cases show similar pattern: Cathar suppression required century-long coordination between French crown and papacy; Spanish Inquisition maintained elite consensus against heresy for centuries; communist purges succeeded when party leadership remained unified.

Geographic Containment: Joan's imprisonment in Rouen, surrounded by English garrisons and hostile populations, prevented rescue or organized resistance. The geographic isolation was not absolute—information about trial reached French territories—but sufficient to prevent effective intervention. Comparative cases demonstrate that challenges spreading across multiple regions become impossible to contain: Protestantism succeeded partly because geographic dispersion across Germanic states prevented unified suppression; Islamic expansion succeeded through rapid geographic spread overwhelming Byzantine capacity for containment; Communist movements survived through international coordination preventing single-state suppression.

Target Vulnerability: Joan as isolated prisoner lacked institutional position, military forces, or powerful family providing protection. Her utility to French elites had been symbolic rather than organizational, leaving no independent power base. Comparative cases show that challenges with institutional foundations prove harder to suppress: Becket's murder created church-state crisis because ecclesiastical institutions defended their authority; Chinese communists survived Nationalist suppression because party organization provided institutional resilience; labor movements succeeded when union structures enabled coordination despite leadership arrests.

Overwhelming Force Application: The English deployed overwhelming institutional force through Inquisitorial procedures, armed guards, theological authorities, and permanent execution method. The force disparity was not merely physical but institutional: legal procedures, theological authority, and social legitimacy all arrayed against solitary peasant. Comparative cases confirm that overwhelming force can eliminate individuals: Stalin's purges succeeded through massive NKVD deployment; Nazi suppression of opposition succeeded through total state power; Tiananmen crackdown succeeded through military superiority. However, force application alone proves insufficient without meeting other conditions.

Multi-Generational Persistence: This condition was not met, explaining narrative survival despite physical elimination. English and Burgundian coordination collapsed within decades as political circumstances changed. Burgundy reconciled with France through Treaty of Arras (1435), English were expelled from continental possessions, and elite interests shifted. Without sustained multi-generational effort, the heresy conviction could be reversed and Joan's narrative rehabilitated. Comparative cases demonstrate that successful suppression requires generations: Spanish Inquisition maintained commitment across centuries to suppress heresy; Chinese suppression of Falun Gong continues decades after initial crackdown; Soviet suppression of religion persisted seventy years before collapse.

The comparative implication is that partial suppression—meeting some but not all five conditions—may eliminate immediate threats while creating more powerful challenges long-term. Joan's execution removed her as constraint on French elite decision-making but created martyr whose narrative proved more potent dead than alive. This suggests that elite suppression attempts should either meet all five conditions or avoid dramatic elimination that creates martyrs. The middle ground—executing charismatic figures without sustained suppression of their narratives—often backfires by enhancing rather than diminishing the challenge.

X. CONCLUSION: SACRED FIGUREHEADS AND THE MECHANICS OF ELITE POWER

The Core Findings

This case study has demonstrated that Joan of Arc's emergence, deployment, and disposal exemplify universal mechanisms through which elites appropriate belief systems to consolidate power over populations. The traditional narrative—miraculous peasant visionary who saved France through divine intervention—obscures systematic elite appropriation of pre-existing religious beliefs for political purposes. The analytical frameworks applied in this study reveal patterns visible across civilizations and epochs when small groups maintain control over large populations through belief infrastructure rather than mere coercive force.

The appropriation succeeded because French elites recognized that embedded Catholic theology about divine revelation, virgin saints, and prophetic guidance provided ready-made narrative infrastructure that could be weaponized for legitimation and mobilization. They did not invent new belief system but identified individual whose claims fit existing theological template and deployed her to solve otherwise intractable political problems: legitimating contested monarch, mobilizing demoralized forces, transforming military stalemate into offensive momentum.

The force multiplication was quantifiable and substantial. French soldiers who fought halfheartedly for noble factions fought with conviction when told they served God's chosen instrument. Populations who resisted taxation for dynastic wars accepted it for sacred mission. Wavering nobles who calculated English alliance as safer switched to Charles when coronation demonstrated divine favor. The belief infrastructure multiplied military effectiveness, extraction capacity, and political support beyond what material resources alone allowed—validating the framework's claim of 50-100x force multiplication.

The elite consciousness of appropriation appears consistently in the evidence. The Poitiers examination evaluated political utility rather than theological truth. The military deployment used Joan for inspiration while maintaining professional command. The abandonment after capture revealed instrumental calculation about her ongoing utility versus constraint. The rehabilitation trial reversed theological verdict based on political timing rather than new religious evidence. These actions demonstrate that French elites understood, at minimum tactically, that belief systems function as deployable resources for power consolidation.

The disposability of figureheads reveals the fundamental asymmetry between charismatic authority and institutional power. Joan provided crucial legitimation for Charles's coronation but became liability when her divine mandate claims constrained elite decision-making about military strategy and political negotiations. Her capture solved elite management problem by removing her without Charles appearing to reject divine mission. The pattern demonstrates that charismatic figures remain valuable only while serving elite interests and become expendable when asserting autonomous authority based on their charismatic credentials.

The long-term consequences extended far beyond immediate military victories. Joan's appropriation strengthened French monarchical absolutism by validating divine mandate tradition, created foundational mythology for French national identity, established template for appropriating religious figures for political purposes, expanded state extraction capacity through

taxation and military mobilization precedents, and generated belief infrastructure that persisted across regime transformations from monarchy through republic to secular state.

Validation of the Analytical Framework

The case study validates the core principles of the Analytical Framework for Elite Power and Belief Systems across multiple dimensions. The framework predicted that elite power depends fundamentally on appropriating pre-existing beliefs rather than inventing new ones—Joan's case confirms this through French nobility's weaponization of existing Catholic theology rather than creation of novel religious narrative. The framework predicted that belief functions as 50-100x force multiplier—Joan's case demonstrates this through quantifiable increases in military effectiveness, taxation compliance, and mobilization capacity. The framework predicted that elites possess consciousness about belief as power infrastructure while common populations remain unconscious of manipulation—Joan's case shows this asymmetry through elite strategic deployment contrasted with popular genuine conviction.

The framework's identification of appropriation constraints receives validation through Joan's case. French elites gained legitimation and mobilization benefits from appropriating Catholic divine revelation theology but also inherited theological limitations on their authority. They could not simply ignore Joan's divine mandate claims without undermining the belief system legitimating their power, creating genuine constraint on elite autonomy. This demonstrates that appropriation, while more effective than invention, creates dependencies that pure coercive power would avoid.

The framework's conditions for successful suppression receive mixed validation through Joan's execution. The English met four of five conditions—elite coordination, geographic containment, target vulnerability, overwhelming force—explaining their success in executing her. However, they failed to maintain multi-generational persistence, explaining why her narrative survived and strengthened. This partial success validates framework's claim that all five conditions must be met for permanent suppression of belief-based challenges.

The framework's prediction about belief infrastructure persistence across regime transformations receives strong validation. Joan's narrative survived from monarchy through revolution to republic to secular state by being reappropriated for each regime's purposes through selective emphasis of compatible elements. The persistence demonstrates that belief systems embedded through cultural transmission become permanent resources that successive elites inherit and redeploy regardless of ideological commitments.

Material Factors and Belief Infrastructure

The case study demonstrates the complex relationship between material conditions and belief infrastructure in determining historical outcomes. Material factors—military capabilities, economic resources, territorial control, technological advantages—set boundaries on what is possible, but belief systems determine how efficiently elites can deploy material resources and how much sacrifice populations will accept.

The military victories at Orléans and Patay resulted from material factors: favorable force ratios once reinforcements arrived, English positional weaknesses with dispersed isolated forts, competent French tactical leadership, and enemy command failures. Joan's contribution was not tactical brilliance or supernatural intervention but belief-based morale enhancement that made soldiers utilize material advantages more effectively. The material conditions made victory possible; the belief infrastructure made it achievable without prohibitive casualties or costs.

The coronation at Reims required material control of the route through Burgundian territory, but Joan's divine mandate narrative reduced resistance and enabled city submissions without prolonged sieges. The material capability for the campaign existed, but belief infrastructure made it strategically viable by reducing costs and accelerating outcomes.

Charles VII's long-term success in expelling English from France resulted from material factors: economic exhaustion of prolonged warfare, Burgundian reconciliation motivated by territorial interests, English domestic political crisis, and French development of effective artillery for siege warfare. Joan's narrative provided temporary mobilization advantage but did not determine ultimate resolution of the Hundred Years' War. Material conditions—which side could sustain costs of continued warfare—determined the outcome.

This relationship suggests that belief infrastructure functions as multiplier of material capacity rather than independent causal force. Elites with overwhelming material advantages may achieve objectives through pure coercion without requiring belief-based legitimation. However, most elite power operates under resource constraints where belief infrastructure becomes essential for scaling capacity beyond material limits. The efficiency gains from voluntary compliance, reduced enforcement costs, and enhanced mobilization make belief systems strategically necessary for sustainable elite power.

The Pattern Beyond Joan

The mechanisms revealed through Joan of Arc's case appear throughout history wherever small groups maintain control over large populations. The pattern includes: elite recognition of appropriable belief systems, institutional validation through controlled procedures, deployment for legitimation and mobilization, constraint management when figureheads assert autonomous authority, disposal when utility expires, and retrospective narrative construction for future appropriation.

Ancient examples include Egyptian pharaohs appropriating solar deity worship, Roman emperors appropriating divine kingship traditions, Chinese dynasties appropriating Mandate of Heaven theology, Islamic caliphates appropriating Muhammad's prophetic authority. Medieval examples include Crusades appropriating Christian holy war theology, papal authority appropriating Petrine succession tradition, European monarchies appropriating divine right kingship. Modern examples include nationalist movements appropriating ethnic identity narratives, communist states appropriating Marxist ideology, fascist regimes appropriating mythic national destiny, democratic states appropriating popular sovereignty and rights discourse.

The universality of the pattern suggests it represents not cultural contingency but structural necessity. Large-scale social organizations require coordination and compliance mechanisms that scale beyond what coercion alone can achieve. Belief systems provide this scaling by creating internalized control—populations self-police, teach children to comply, and accept sacrifices beyond what force could compel. Elites who master belief infrastructure deployment gain decisive advantages over those relying primarily on material coercion.

The contemporary implications extend beyond historical analysis to understanding present elite power. Modern states deploy nationalist narratives, democratic legitimacy claims, human rights discourse, and ideological frameworks—all functioning as belief infrastructure legitimating authority and mobilizing populations. The mechanisms differ in content from medieval Christianity but operate through identical structural patterns: appropriating pre-existing cultural beliefs, validating through controlled institutions, deploying for extraction and compliance, managing constraints, creating permanent cultural resources through education and commemoration.

Limitations and Contingencies

The case study's materialist analysis should not be misunderstood as claiming all outcomes were predetermined or that individual agency was irrelevant. Joan of Arc was genuine historical individual who made choices, possessed convictions, and influenced events through personal actions. The analysis demonstrates that her historical significance resulted from elite appropriation of her narrative rather than supernatural intervention, but this does not imply her personal characteristics were irrelevant.

Joan's personal courage, military competence, evident sincerity, and charismatic presence were necessary conditions for her appropriation—French elites needed figurehead with specific characteristics to make divine mandate narrative credible. If she had been cowardly, incompetent, obviously calculating, or lacking charisma, the appropriation would have failed regardless of elite intentions. Her genuine belief in her divine mission made her more effective mobilization tool than cynical collaborator would have been. The personal attributes mattered; what made them historically consequential was elite recognition of their utility.

Contingent factors significantly influenced specific outcomes even within structural constraints. If Salisbury had not been killed at Orléans, English siege might have succeeded and Joan never become significant. If Charles had possessed resources for effective military campaigns without Joan's appropriation, her narrative might have been unnecessary. If Burgundy had remained committed to English alliance, French victory might have been impossible regardless of belief mobilization. The material conditions and chance events created opportunity space within which elite appropriation operated.

The analysis also acknowledges cultural and institutional specificity. The mechanisms deployed in fifteenth-century Catholic France differed in content from those in other contexts while sharing structural patterns. The specific theological elements appropriated (virgin saints, divine revelation, prophetic guidance), the institutional procedures for validation (Poitiers examination,

coronation ritual, heresy trial), and the narrative themes emphasized (national salvation, sacred kingship, martyrdom) reflected particular cultural context. Other civilizations would appropriate different belief systems through different institutions while following similar overall patterns.

Final Assessment: Belief as Power Infrastructure

The fundamental insight this case study demonstrates is that belief is not autonomous spiritual force but engineered infrastructure for elite power. Populations comply with extraction and accept hierarchy not primarily because they are coerced but because they believe—in legitimacy of rulers, justice of systems, naturalness of hierarchy, necessity of their subordination. These beliefs are not discovered truths but constructed narratives, refined over generations to serve elite interests regardless of whether any particular elite consciously designed them.

Joan of Arc was not miraculous exception to these mechanics but textbook demonstration of them. The French nobility facing existential threat recognized in her claims ready-made narrative infrastructure that could mobilize forces, legitimate authority, and transform weak claimant into God's anointed king. They did not passively respond to miracle; they actively deployed figurehead whose divine credentials could accomplish what military force and political negotiation alone could not.

Understanding this mechanism does not require dismissing Joan's courage, military competence, or genuine faith. It requires recognizing that personal attributes become historically significant only when elites decide to deploy them for strategic purposes. Many peasant girls claimed divine visions in fifteenth-century France; Joan's visions mattered because French nobles recognized their utility for solving political problems. Her faith may have been sincere; what made it consequential was elite appropriation of that sincerity for purposes of power consolidation.

The pattern illuminates how small groups control large populations across all civilizations and epochs. When elites face legitimacy crises, they do not invent new belief systems but discover how to weaponize existing ones. When populations accept enormous sacrifices, they do so not primarily because of coercion but because belief systems make domination feel necessary, just, or divinely ordained. When charismatic figureheads emerge, their utility to elites determines their survival far more than their personal convictions or supernatural credentials.

This is the fundamental reality that Joan of Arc's story reveals when analyzed through materialist frameworks rather than hagiographic narratives: belief is infrastructure, figureheads are tools, and the sacred serves the strategic. The sooner populations recognize these mechanisms, the sooner they can resist the manipulation. The longer elites maintain asymmetry between their consciousness of belief as power infrastructure and common populations' unconsciousness of that manipulation, the longer elite domination persists regardless of democratic rhetoric or revolutionary promises.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following sources are organized thematically to facilitate research into specific aspects of Joan of Arc's historical context, the Hundred Years' War, medieval French society, and the theoretical frameworks applied in this analysis.

Primary Sources: Trial Records and Contemporary Documents

Hobbins, Daniel, trans. and ed. *The Trial of Joan of Arc*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Murray, T. Douglas, ed. *Jeanne d'Arc, Maid of Orleans, Deliverer of France: Being the Story of Her Life, Her Achievements, and Her Death, as Attested on Oath and Set Forth in the Original Documents*. London: William Heinemann, 1902.

Pernoud, Régine, and Marie-Véronique Clin, eds. *Joan of Arc: Her Story*. Translated by Jeremy DuQuesnay Adams. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998. [Contains extensive translated excerpts from trial records and contemporary documents]

Quicherat, Jules, ed. *Procès de condamnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc, dite la Pucelle*. 5 vols. Paris: Jules Renouard, 1841-1849. [French critical edition of trial records]

Scott, W.S., trans. *The Trial of Joan of Arc: Being the Verbatim Report of the Proceedings from the Orleans Manuscript*. London: Folio Society, 1956.

Taylor, Craig, ed. *Joan of Arc: La Pucelle*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006. [Selected documents in English translation]

Primary Sources: Chronicles and Contemporary Narratives

Basin, Thomas. *Histoire de Charles VII*. Edited and translated by Charles Samaran. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1933-1944.

Bouvier, Gilles le. *Les Chroniques du roi Charles VII*. Edited by Henri Courteault and Léonce Celier. Paris: Klincksieck, 1979.

Chartier, Jean. *Chronique de Charles VII, roi de France*. Edited by Vallet de Viriville. 3 vols. Paris: P. Jannet, 1858.

Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris, 1405-1449. Edited by Alexandre Tuetey. Paris: H. Champion, 1881. [Contemporary Parisian perspective]

Journal du siège d'Orléans et du voyage de Reims, 1428-1429. Edited by P. Charpentier and C. Cuissard. Orléans: H. Herluison, 1896.

Monstrelet, Enguerrand de. *Chronique*. Edited by L. Douët-d'Arcq. 6 vols. Paris: Renouard, 1857-1862.

Perceval de Cagny. *Chronique*. Edited by Henri Moranvillé. Paris: Renouard, 1902. [Written by squire to Duke of Alençon]

Secondary Sources: Joan of Arc Biographies and Specialized Studies

Castor, Helen. *Joan of Arc: A History*. London: Faber and Faber, 2014.

DeVries, Kelly. *Joan of Arc: A Military Leader*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1999.

Fraioli, Deborah. *Joan of Arc: The Early Debate*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2000.

Gies, Frances. *Joan of Arc: The Legend and the Reality*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

Harrison, Kathryn. *Joan of Arc: A Life Transfigured*. New York: Doubleday, 2014.

Pernoud, Régine. *Joan of Arc: By Herself and Her Witnesses*. Translated by Edward Hyams. New York: Scarborough House, 1994.

Richey, Stephen W. *Joan of Arc: The Warrior Saint*. Westport: Praeger, 2003.

Sackville-West, Vita. *Saint Joan of Arc*. London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1936.

Sullivan, Karen. *The Interrogation of Joan of Arc*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

Taylor, Larissa Juliet. *The Virgin Warrior: The Life and Death of Joan of Arc*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Warner, Marina. *Joan of Arc: The Image of Female Heroism*. New York: Knopf, 1981.

Wheeler, Bonnie, and Charles T. Wood, eds. *Fresh Verdicts on Joan of Arc*. New York: Garland, 1996.

The Hundred Years' War: General Histories and Military Analysis

Allmand, Christopher. *The Hundred Years War: England and France at War, c. 1300-c. 1450*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Curry, Anne. *The Hundred Years War, 1337-1453*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002.

Curry, Anne, and Michael Hughes, eds. *Arms, Armies and Fortifications in the Hundred Years War*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994.

DeVries, Kelly. *Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century: Discipline, Tactics, and Technology*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1996.

Fowler, Kenneth. *The Age of Plantagenet and Valois: The Struggle for Supremacy, 1328-1498*. New York: Putnam, 1967.

Seward, Desmond. *The Hundred Years War: The English in France, 1337-1453*. New York: Atheneum, 1978.

Sumption, Jonathan. *The Hundred Years War*. 4 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990-2015. [Comprehensive modern treatment]

Vale, Malcolm. *Charles VII*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Wagner, John A. *Encyclopedia of the Hundred Years War*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2006.

Medieval French Society, Politics, and Institutions

Autrand, Françoise. *Charles VI: La Folie du roi*. Paris: Fayard, 1986.

Chevalier, Bernard. *Les bonnes villes de France du XIVe au XVIe siècle*. Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1982.

Contamine, Philippe. *Guerre, état et société à la fin du Moyen Âge: Études sur les armées des rois de France, 1337-1494*. Paris: Mouton, 1972.

Famiglietti, R.C. *Royal Intrigue: Crisis at the Court of Charles VI, 1392-1420*. New York: AMS Press, 1986.

Guenée, Bernard. *Between Church and State: The Lives of Four French Prelates in the Late Middle Ages*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Lewis, P.S. *Later Medieval France: The Polity*. London: Macmillan, 1968.

Lot, Ferdinand, and Robert Fawtier. *Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen âge*. 3 vols. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957-1962.

Vaughan, Richard. *Philip the Good: The Apogee of Burgundy*. London: Longmans, 1970.

Vaughan, Richard. *John the Fearless: The Growth of Burgundian Power*. London: Longmans, 1966.

Medieval Religion, Theology, and Ecclesiastical Authority

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Elliott, Dyan. *Proving Woman: Female Spirituality and Inquisitional Culture in the Later Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Kieckhefer, Richard. *Unquiet Souls: Fourteenth-Century Saints and Their Religious Milieu*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Lambert, Malcolm. *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Matter, E. Ann, and John Coakley, eds. *Creative Women in Medieval and Early Modern Italy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.

Newman, Barbara. *From Virile Woman to WomanChrist: Studies in Medieval Religion and Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Oakley, Francis. *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Swanson, R.N. *Religion and Devotion in Europe, c. 1215-c. 1515*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Vauchez, André. *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*. Translated by Jean Birrell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Women, Gender, and Power in Medieval Society

Amt, Emilie, ed. *Women's Lives in Medieval Europe: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Bennett, Judith M. *History Matters: Patriarchy and the Challenge of Feminism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Duby, Georges, and Michelle Perrot, eds. *A History of Women in the West, Volume II: Silences of the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Erler, Mary, and Maryanne Kowaleski, eds. *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1988.

Gilchrist, Roberta. *Gender and Archaeology: Contesting the Past*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Goldberg, P.J.P. *Women, Work, and Life Cycle in a Medieval Economy: Women in York and Yorkshire, c. 1300-1520*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Karras, Ruth Mazo. *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

Parsons, John Carmi, and Bonnie Wheeler, eds. *Medieval Mothering*. New York: Garland, 1996.

Shahar, Shulamith. *The Fourth Estate: A History of Women in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Chaya Galai. London: Methuen, 1983.

Prophecy, Visions, and Political Legitimation

Coote, Lesley A. *Prophecy and Public Affairs in Later Medieval England*. York: York Medieval Press, 2000.

Hotchkiss, Valerie R. *Clothes Make the Man: Female Cross Dressing in Medieval Europe*. New York: Garland, 1996.

Jansen, Katherine Ludwig. *The Making of the Magdalen: Preaching and Popular Devotion in the Later Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

McGinn, Bernard. *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.

Reeves, Marjorie. *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Smoller, Laura Ackerman. *History, Prophecy, and the Stars: The Christian Astrology of Pierre d'Ailly, 1350-1420*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Taylor, Craig. *Heresy, Crusade and Inquisition in Medieval Quercy*. Woodbridge: York Medieval Press, 2011.

Medieval Warfare, Military Organization, and Technology

Bradbury, Jim. *The Medieval Archer*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

Contamine, Philippe. *War in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Michael Jones. Oxford: Blackwell, 1984.

DeVries, Kelly. *Medieval Military Technology*. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 1992.

France, John. *Western Warfare in the Age of the Crusades, 1000-1300*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Keen, Maurice, ed. *Medieval Warfare: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Rogers, Clifford J., ed. *The Military Revolution Debate: Readings on the Military Transformation of Early Modern Europe*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1995.

Strickland, Matthew, and Robert Hardy. *The Great Warbow: From Hastings to the Mary Rose*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2005.

Vale, Malcolm. *War and Chivalry: Warfare and Aristocratic Culture in England, France and Burgundy at the End of the Middle Ages*. London: Duckworth, 1981.

Nationalism, National Identity, and Historical Memory

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso, 2006.

Bell, David A. *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680-1800*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Krumeich, Gerd. *Jeanne d'Arc in der Geschichte: Historiographie, Politik, Kultur*. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1989.

Nora, Pierre, ed. *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*. 3 vols. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996-1998.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.

Winock, Michel. *Jeanne d'Arc*. In *Les Lieux de mémoire*, edited by Pierre Nora, vol. 3. Paris: Gallimard, 1992.

Theoretical and Comparative: Power, Ideology, and Belief Systems

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1977.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power, Volume I: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Scott, James C. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books, 1966.

Tilly, Charles. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. 2 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

END OF CASE STUDY

This case study applies the Analytical Framework for Elite Power and Belief Systems and the Expanded Core Framework to demonstrate how Joan of Arc's emergence, deployment, and disposal exemplify universal mechanisms of elite power consolidation through appropriation of belief infrastructure. The analysis reveals that what appeared as miraculous intervention was systematic elite deployment of pre-existing religious narratives to solve political legitimacy crisis, mobilize military forces, and establish lasting structures of royal authority and national identity.

Copyright and Attribution

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Case study developed collaboratively between Thomas J. Bryan and Claude (Anthropic) applying systematic analytical frameworks to historical evidence.